DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 518 JC 690 367

AUTHOR Palinchak, Robert Stephen
TITLE An Analysis of Selected Factors that Identify the Two-Year College as Being More Closely Related to Either Secondary Education or Higher Education.
PUB DATE May 69
NOTE 223p.; Master of Arts thesis

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *College Role, Development, *Educational Trends, *Higher Education, *Junior Colleges, Masters Theses, *Secondary Education

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to select and analyze certain factors that identify 2-year colleges as being more closely related to either secondary education or higher education. Factors analyzed included: (1) educational terminology; (2) the influence of early 2-year colleges; (3) the changes in self-concept, program, faculty, and students the junior college has undergone as the result of changes in pattern of control and organization since 1940; (4) standards used on regional and professional levels in evaluating the 2-year college; (5) pertinent legislation and legal regulations; (6) curriculums offered; and (7) articulation, or the manner in which legislators and educators deal with intercommunication among the various levels of education. This analysis was prefaced by a review of pertinent literature that revealed historical and contemporary views of the status of the junior college in the educational hierarchy. It was concluded that the 2-year college is presently much closer in status and identity to the senior colleges and universities than to the secondary schools. The junior college is, however, an ever-changing educational innovation that selectively characterizes certain aspects of both secondary and higher education but, maintaining a still greater degree of its own character, it represents a new and unique institution of higher education. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (MB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED FACTORS THAT IDENTIFY THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE AS BEING MORE CLOSELY RELATED TO EITHER SECONDARY EDUCATION OR HIGHER EDUCATION

ED034518

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate Division
Loyola College
Baltimore, Maryland

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

---

by
Robert Stephen Palinchak
May 1969

JC 690 367

The thesis, AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED FACTORS THAT IDENTIFY THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE AS BEING MORE CLOSELY RELATED TO EITHER SECONDARY EDUCATION OR HIGHER EDUCATION, submitted by Robert Stephen Palinchak, has been accepted as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Education.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY—
Approved DONALD J. REITZ Ph.D.

Approved FRANK P. FAIRBANK

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 05 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
[illegible]

For their critical comments that guided the organization of this Thesis, the writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Donald J. Reitz and Mr. Frank P. Fairbank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE PROBLEM 1
  Statement of the Problem 1
  Selected Factors 2
    Terminology 2
    Early Influences 3
    A Further Development of the Problem 3
    Standards 4
    Curriculum 4
    Articulation 5
  Importance of the Study 5
  Method of the Study 6
  Limitations of the Study 7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 9
  Related Studies 16
III. DISCUSSION OF TERMINOLOGY 17
  The National Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Schools 17
  Collegiate and Higher Education 19
  Legal Nomenclature 22
  Occupational and Vocational Terminology 24
  State Department Nomenclature 26
  Descriptive Nomenclature 28

CHAPTER PAGE

Summary and Implications for This Study 30

IV. EARLY INFLUENCES (1890's--1940's) 33

An Attempt to Clarify the Oldest Two-Year College 33

The Two-Year College Viewed in the Light of Secondary Schools 38

The Influence of Henry Phillips Tappan . . . 40

The Influence of William Watts Folwell . . . 41

William Rainey Harper and School Reorganization 43

Leonard V. Koos and a General Line of Demarcation 44

Organizational Patterns Involving the High School and Two-Year College 46

The Two-Year College Viewed in the Light of Four-Year Colleges 53

Formative Legislation Affecting the Status of the Two-Year College 62

Secondary Status in California 63

Other States 67

Summary of the Early Influence on the Two-Year College 71

V. A FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBLEM (1940's--Present) 73

CHAPTER PAGE

The Present Conflict: A Dual Status 73

Strength in Diversity 80

Relative to Secondary Education 82

Relative to Higher Education 86

Public Service and Support 89

On Becoming a Four-Year Institution 91

The Two-Year College Teachers 94

State-College Relationships 98

Master Plans 100

The Maryland Master Plan 101

VI. STANDARDS 104

State Department-Legislative Standards 105

California 110

New York 116

New Jersey 118

Florida 121

Maryland 122

Accreditation Practices 125

Regional Accreditation 125

Professional Accreditation 133

Federal Standards 136

VII. CURRICULAR IMPLICATIONS 141

Vocationalism 147

CHAPTER PAGE

VIII. ARTICULATION--DOWNWARD AND UPWARD 159

Downward Articulation 159

Upward Articulation 165

Articulation Proposals and Implications 170

California 172

Illinois 176

Michigan 177

Florida 177

New York 180

Maryland 182

Summary 184

IX. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 187

BIBLIOGRAPHY 197

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Comparison of Secondary School, College, and University Aims--1924 45

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

For many years a difference of opinion has existed concerning the relative status of the emerging two-year college as being more closely identified with the secondary schools or higher education. While present trends appear to favor the latter position, little evidence has been formulated to support this contention.

Statement of the Problem

Since 1900, the American system of public education has been undergoing a modification or reorganization with reference to "fitting" the two-year college into the general scheme. This far-reaching reorganization is often subtle, indirect, and sometimes completely inconsistent with the more dominant educational themes or plans.

This paper deals with a movement that has firmly acquired the impetus of a national project from a multitude of imperceptible origins. The junior college movement has the national momentum of a centralized effort. Ironically, this centralized effort gains impetus while attempting to decentralize higher education in this country.

Furthermore, there appears to have been no effectively recognized leadership in the early two-year college movement so that localized needs and interests have engendered a multicomplicity of factors that have since merged and lost their proper identity when viewed as the national movement that it now is.

This reorganization appears more often than not to have been fostered by many interrelated factors rather than by simple design. It has emerged so gradually and imperceptibly that there is often little consciousness of its deep character and ramifications.

Much too often the question is raised concerning the proper position of community-junior colleges in the hierarchy of educational institutions which range from pre-elementary schools to postgraduate universities. As an institution in its own right, the two-year college is often identified as extending upward from secondary schools or downward from collegiate higher education.

It is the purpose of this study to select and analyze certain factors insofar as those factors help to identify the present two-year college as being more closely related to either secondary education or higher education.

Selected Factors

The following are among the factors to be analyzed:

Terminology. An analysis of terms and definitions used in the educational field, appropriate to the thesis, is presented. The purpose of this portion is not merely for elucidation. It is strongly felt that terminology itself constitutes a basic causal relationship to the problem at hand.

Early Influences (1890's--1940's). This portion considers the influence of early two-year colleges and their leaders in the light of their distinctive characteristics insofar as some are closely associated with secondary education while others are representative of higher education. It is felt that an analysis of the generation of universities and states that spawned the two-year college will have implications for the contemporary scene. Finally, a brief glimpse at early influencing legislation in areas selected for their general innovation and leadership is presented with the intention of seeking relationships and implications for this study.

A Further Development of the Problem (1940's--present). The problem of identity for two-year colleges becomes eminent in this period, which signifies major socio-economic changes in the strata of our society. The educative process is more reflective of these changes and some issues begin to lose their identity while others begin to emerge in a definite pattern. An analysis of how the institution views itself, its program, faculty and students, in the light of new patterns of control and organization, is presented. The two-year college begins to acquire a more firm identity which is analyzed in the light of its relationship to other institutions of education. This analysis has the purpose of defining lines of demarcation, wherever possible, among the institutions under study.

Standards. The accrediting process is examined on both the regional and professional levels to detect its relevance to the status of the two-year college as an institution of secondary education or higher education.

An analysis of some pertinent legislation and the legal regulations of the present two-year college is also presented. In addition, federal funding legislation is viewed insofar as it often establishes standards that are definitive of higher education, both for two and four-year institutions.

Curriculum. An analysis is made of some curriculums that are offered in the two-year college insofar as their general effect tends to classify the two-year college as an institution of secondary education or higher education. Also, vocational education is reviewed since it constitutes a major portion of the curriculums as offered in both the high schools and two-year colleges. Distinguishing characteristics between the two institutions are sought in the light of curricular implications.

Articulation. The manner in which legislators and educators deal with intercommunication between the various levels of education is revealing. The effectiveness of the manner in which the junior college joins in a working partnership with both the secondary schools and senior colleges constitutes a realistic form of articulation. An analysis of this intercourse is presented with the hope of detecting how close the junior college works with secondary schools on one hand and senior colleges on the other. In effect, such knowledge could enable us to establish lines of demarcation among the tripartite educational levels.

Importance of the Study

The junior college movement gives many indications of rapid growth and development. Its quantitative aspects are staggering with reference to the numbers of students, teachers, and institutions that are directly involved. Nonetheless, there still exists a scarcity of educators who have been properly prepared to adapt to the junior college movement. Many teachers, for example, secure a position in the two-year college only after experiencing disappointment at their former positions in high schools, senior colleges, and industry.

The fruitful products of extensive institutional research are just now beginning to emerge for the junior college movement. There exists an urgent need for current studies which more clearly explain the role of the junior college, not only in terms of itself, but also in terms of its relationship with the secondary schools and four-year colleges.

Clarifying the status of the two-year college with reference to institutions of secondary or higher education is indeed a subject that warrants immediate analysis and, as such, constitutes a justification for this study.

Method of the Study

An attempt will be made to clearly identify and evaluate those selected factors that influence the status of the two-year college as being more closely identified with secondary education or higher education. The method of logical analysis will be used to evaluate the data. Such factors as curriculum and articulation procedures are presented with direct reference to secondary schools on one hand and four-year colleges on the other. An analysis of these factors is presented in a compare and contrast manner with hopes of detecting the various degrees of relevance to the junior college movement. Those factors that are more common to high schools and junior colleges will be noted as influencing the "secondary status" of the two-year college. Those factors that tend to be more common to senior colleges and junior colleges are identified as promoting the higher education status of the two-year college.

The study will be further developed by analyzing the various criteria used for the determination of standards, accreditation on regional and professional levels, issuance of degrees, certificates or diplomas, such that a more definite identity may be established for the two-year college. This should reveal a clearer picture of how the two-year college fits into the entire structure of education.

Limitations of the Study

This study will not undertake to investigate the following:

1. Non-public two-year colleges such as religious, private, technical, or independent.
2. The two-year college movement.
3. Faculty qualifications (both secondary and higher education).
4. Present or pending two-year college legislation.
5. Administrative and organizational techniques as employed on local, state, and national levels.

While each of the above limitations offers various degrees of significance to this study, it should be noted that they involve very broad studies in themselves and, as such, constitute other areas in need of research and clarification.

Certain regions, such as California and Florida, and legislation, such as the Nurse Training Act, Higher Education Facilities Act, and the Vocational Education Act of 1963, are chosen for analysis specifically because they reflect leadership and immediate insight to the understanding of this study.

These and other specific areas to be analyzed must be considered incidental to the thesis. The general issue is an analysis of legal, functional, and operational relationships among the specified institutions. While functional aspects are those which are considered normal or characteristic of the junior college movement, the operational aspects define the actual working process. Functional aspects may be thought of as being ideal or theoretical, while the operational aspects are more realistic and pragmatic. The two are not always in agreement and it is felt that a closer look at both will be helpful to this study. The ultimate objective is to reveal the present status and identity of the two-year college with reference to its current relationship with both secondary and higher education.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The following survey is generally representative of the literature embodied in this study. It is not meant to be exhaustive. By its very nature it cannot be.

The _Junior College Journal_ is perhaps the best source for reports from within the movement. It is the voice of the American Association of Junior Colleges and covers all aspects of the two-year college, including accreditation, articulation, changing patterns, local and state issues, terminology and trends.

The North Central Association Quarterly deals directly with general accreditation issues. In addition, it presents organizational conflicts as in the case of two-year colleges becoming four-year institutions.

Burt's _Industry and Vocational-Technical Education_[1] is a prime source for defining and differentiating among the various terms employed in this field as well as a relation of this area to secondary and higher education. Emerson[2] presents various criteria that should be considered when deciding whether a technical-vocational curriculum should be offered at the post-high school level.

---

[1] Samuel M. Burt, _Industry and Vocational-Technical Education_ (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), pp. vii-ix, preface.

[2] Lynn A. Emerson, "Occupational Education in the Future Community College," _Technical Education News_ (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965), pp. 5-6.

Toews,[3] Allen,[4] and others provide substantive definitions of "higher education" while Gleazer[5] states that the questionable status of the junior college is due to misconceptions of higher education. Scannel[6] provides a definition of "terminal" education but cites its undesirable connotations. Skaggs[7] reports that "collegiate" education is no longer appropriate as used in the past. Mathies[8] calls the whole area of educational terminology an enigma to communication.

---

[3] Emil O. Toews, "Janus Looks at the Junior College," California Education, 1:10, June, 1964.

[4] Lucille Allen, John J. Geise and Ben Euwema, "The Nature and Functions of Higher Education," College and University, 35:29-33, Fall, 1959.

[5] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "Junior College and Technical Education," School and Society, 94:340, October, 1966.

[6] William J. Scannel, "What Do Teachers Think About English in the Two-Year College?" Junior College Journal, 37:25-26, September, 1966.

[7] Kenneth G. Skaggs, "Report from St. Louis," Junior College Journal, 37:42, September, 1966.

[8] Lorraine Mathies, "Junior College Educators Indicate Information They Need," Junior College Journal, 38:24-26, November, 1967.

Kintzer[9] and Cohen,[10] writing on current issues in higher education, cite the two-year college as primarily a quality teaching institution while Anderson[11] reports that it is often accused of offering "inferior instruction."

According to Harrington,[12] faculty unrest is related to the questionable status of the two-year college and he suggests the use of a rank system in order to resemble higher education. Lahti[13] sees more faculty responsibility as a means of obtaining a genuine role in higher education.

Priest[14] sees the two-year college as having parts of both the high school and four-year college imbedded in its make-up while speaking of its "secondary status."[15]

---

[9] Frederick C. Kintzer, "What University and College Admissions Officers Should Know About Two-Year Colleges," College and University, 42:477, Summer, 1967.

[10] Arthur M. Cohen, "Developing Specialists in Learning," Junior College Journal, 37:21, September, 1966.

[11] John E. Anderson, Jr., "Research in the Junior College: Anethema or Anodyne?", Junior College Journal, 35:16, November, 1964.

[12] John C. Harrington, "Academic Rank in the Community College," Junior College Journal, 35:25, March, 1965.

[13] Robert E. Lahti, "A Faculty Role in Policy Formulation," Junior College Journal, 37:11, September, 1966.

[14] Bill J. Priest, "Faculty-Administration Relationships," Junior College Journal, 34:4-8, March, 1964.

[15] Ibid.

He also proposes that the "new" teacher makes the institution a "glorified high school" or "little university."[16] Hickok reports that critics often cite a function of the junior college to be that of a "baby sitting institution."[17] Furthermore, many question the teaching effectiveness of the two-year college.[18]

Johnson,[19] representing the Maryland Association of Junior Colleges, calls for their closer alignment with higher education rather than the secondary schools so that they may function more effectively. Garrison[20] says the last decade ended their being grades thirteen and fourteen and they are now an integral part of higher education. Price,[21] however, expresses a desire to have them separated from the supervision and control of higher education.

---

[16] Bill J. Priest, "On the Threshold of Greatness," Junior College Journal, 37:7, September, 1966.

[17] Helen Hickok, "Ask the Junior College Parents What They Think!" Junior College Journal, 35:24-27, November, 1964.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Paul L. Johnson, "Statement of Position," Maryland Association of Junior Colleges, October 11, 1968.

[20] Roger H. Garrison, "Unique Problems of Junior Colleges," NEA Journal, 56:30-32, November, 1967.

[21] Hugh G. Price, "Public Schools Through Grade 14," NEA Journal, 48:10, December, 1959.

Cohen[22] sees the two-year college as an upward extension of the high school with certain ties still remaining. Cox[23] reports that the junior college meets its responsibility as an agent of higher education. Vail[24] also sees it as an upward extension of the high school; Castell[25] sees its basis for operation a detaching of the first two years of college from four-year institutions; and Deyo[26] says it is junior to nothing, being a full-fledged partner in higher education.

Dotson,[27] writing in the *Journal of Secondary Education*, says the gains made by the two-year college were made at the expense of the secondary schools. Medsker[28] cautions the junior college not to imitate or become a four-year college.

---

[22] Cohen, *loc. cit.*

[23] Miriam Cox, "The College is for Everyone Cult," *Junior College Journal*, 37:39, September, 1966.

[24] Curtis C. D. Vail, "Adult Education," *University of Washington College of Education Record*, 11:50, February, 1945.

[25] Aubrey Castell, "Wanted: A New Deal for the Liberal Arts College," *University of Washington College of Education Record*, 22:18, January, 1956.

[26] Donald E. Deyo, "Three Cliches," *Junior College Journal*, 34:6, September, 1963.

[27] George E. Dotson, "Advantages to the Junior College of 'Common Administration' School Districts," *Journal of Secondary Education*, 38:148-150, March, 1963.

[28] Leland L. Medsker, *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect*. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), p. 53.

According to Morrisett, the present national assessment program may provide sufficient information to differentiate the two-year college from other educational institutions.[29]

The United States Office of Education Bulletins concerning the two-year colleges are comprehensive and up-to-date with current issues such as state versus local control and junior college financing on local, regional, and national levels. Enrollment statistics are also presented which reveal much about the character of the two-year college student. Statistics also reveal organizational and administrative patterns as evidenced by local, county, district, and multi-district junior college units. Federal legislation is also presented in these Bulletins and relates the junior college to specific aspects of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Vocational Education Act, and the Economics Opportunities Act of 1964, among others. Finally, this source reveals current trends such as changing patterns of control and state involvements with junior colleges in master plans.

California Education is a prime source for a complete history of the early movement as well as a reflection of junior college leadership and innovation in the United States.

---

[29] Lloyd N. Morrisett, "Educational Assessment and the Junior College," Junior College Journal, 37:12-14, March, 1967.

The early movement is traced in detail and present aspects involving the junior college with the secondary schools of California is presented. The unique quest for status differentiation is viewed as an unfinished process.

The School Review, School and Society, and Educational Review are equally valuable as sources of the early and continued conflicts between the secondary schools and the junior colleges. Such conflicts include having a single principal and physical plant for the composite high school--junior college. It is also shown that the early junior college was indeed an integral part of the secondary school to the extent that the faculty and curriculum was shared. The argument of identifying the two-year college as an upward extension of the secondary school is best portrayed here. The terms "grade thirteen" and "grade fourteen" begin to appear in the literature as does the descriptive phrase "high school college." Most early accounts of the two-year college show it to have been more closely aligned with the secondary schools rather than with the four-year colleges.

The University of Washington College of Education Record is a prime source for studying the early two-year college accrediting process as well as President Harper's initial conception of the two-year college.

Finally, the prolific but scholarly writings of Koos and Eells are the best detailed references to the early two-year college movement in the United States. These writings provide encyclopedic background material.

Related Studies

Extensive review of the professional literature reveals two sources that are chiefly concerned with the subject under study. One source, the Office of Education Bulletin 1962, No. 14,[30] indeed paraphrases the topic of this thesis but offers no conclusion whatsoever other than to suggest a need for further study. Specifically, a request is issued for further clarification of the relative position of the two-year college in the whole of public education.

A pertinent report by Friedman appears as an article in the AAUP Bulletin (December, 1966).[31] Here is found a sociological approach that reveals the nature of the two-year college and its faculty when viewed in its quest for status and identity differentiation. This article is quite apropos and will be referred to in this study. A further development of sociological implications ought to prove quite revealing for the two-year college and, as such, constitutes an area in need of research.

---

[30] "Are Public Two-Year Colleges Secondary or Higher Education?", State Formulas for the Support of Public Two-Year Colleges, Office of Education, Bulletin 1962, No. 14 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962), p. 33

[31] Norman L. Friedman, "Comprehensiveness and Higher Education: A Sociologist's View of Public Junior College Trends," AAUP Bulletin, 52:417-423, December, 1966.

CHAPTER III

DISCUSSION OF TERMINOLOGY

This chapter focuses on the nomenclature and terminology that is used to relate, identify and describe the two-year college. It will demonstrate that a firm consensus is lacking among educators, legislators, and the professional literature. Whether or not the two-year college belongs to secondary or higher education is intrinsically involved in the definition of higher education.

The National Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Schools

That there is a need for more uniform nomenclature has been apparent for some time. In 1915 the National Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Schools recognized difficulties encountered in the use and meaning of terms commonly used in the high school field.[1] At that time the secondary schools were defined as follows:

> . . . [They are] distinguished from collegiate education in that the former wholly excludes and the latter only includes subjects involving relative maturity of mind and treatment. The latter requires a mental attitude of detachment from the materials dealt with, whereas in method, high school teaching requires the personalization and evaluating of content of studies.[2]

---

[1] "High School Terminology," The School Review, 23:491-492, September, 1915.

[2] Charles Hughes Johnston, "High School Terminology," Educational Review, 49:232-233, March, 1915.

A majority of the state superintendents expressed agreement in adopting the following definitions as presented by the National Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Schools:

> Senior high school [is that portion] above the ninth grade which is organized under a distinctive internal management of special principal and teacher and which includes in its curriculums instruction covering three, four or five years beyond the junior high school . . .[3]

As a part of the definition of "high school," it is noted that a "high school may extend its courses and its curriculums over periods of four, five, six, seven or eight years."[4]

> Junior College [is that portion which] embraces the years and courses of instruction beyond the twelfth grade, and which may be considered as equivalent to the corresponding work on the first two years of . . . college . . . .[5]

Due to the variety of organizational patterns, it was also recommended that some high schools be called "partial high schools," or "grade extension schools," or "incomplete high schools," or simply "one year, two year, or three year high schools."[6] Such possibilities, while offering flexibility in organizational patterns, also tended to associate the two-year college concept with that of the secondary schools.

---

[3] Ibid., p. 234.

[4] Ibid., p. 233.

[5] Ibid., p. 234.

[6] Ibid.

Even prior to the Commission's awareness of a terminology problem, Brown called in despair for someone to define the terms "high school," "college," and "university."

> . . . if the state legislature, the state department of public instruction, or the American commissioner of education would once for all define these three items, they would free us from much inextricable educational jumble in our use of [these] terms.[7]

That this plea has gone unheeded is evident at the present time.

Collegiate and Higher Education

Skaggs[8] reports that the term "collegiate" is changing, especially as applied to the two-year college. Doyle[9] simply calls for clarifying the meaning of higher education.

Allen and others consider higher education to be the capstone of secondary education and the end of formal schooling. They place it higher than primary or secondary education, but lower than graduate or professional levels. The test, as they see it, is specialization and a degree of mastery with reference to an entire field of knowledge.[10]

---

[7] J. Stanley Brown, "Present Development of Secondary Schools According to the Proposed Plan," The School Review, 13:16-17, January, 1905.

[8] Kenneth G. Skaggs, "Report from St. Louis," Junior College Journal, 37:42, September, 1966.

[9] Walter Doyle, "Community-College Concept In Higher Education," Catholic Educational Review, 64:262, April, 1966.

As a spokesman for the two-year college movement, Gleazer warns that "until some of the misconceptions about what constitutes higher education are eliminated, the potential of community colleges and technical institutes will not be realized."[11] Mathies cites the whole field of education as having long been noted for its vagueness and varied interpretations of specialized terminology. He considers the present situation to be an "enigma to communication."[12]

Toews says that higher education:

> . . . is thought of as an education beyond high school and serving the educational needs of post-high school age men and women without identifying "collegiate" education with four year colleges and universities . . . .[13]

Indeed, collegiate need not be classically associated with the ivy halls of a four-year institution. Some states recognize collegiate education to begin inclusively with the twelfth grade of high school. Such a condition would clearly make the junior college an institution of higher education.

---

[10] Lucille Allen, John J. Geise, Ben Euwema, "The Nature and Functions of Higher Education," College and University, 35: 29-33, Fall, 1959.

[11] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "Junior College and Technical Education," School and Society, 94:340, October, 1966.

[12] Lorraine Mathies, "Junior College Educators Indicate Information They Need," Junior College Journal, 38:24-26, November, 1967.

[13] Emil O. Toews, "Janus Looks at the Junior College," California Education, 1:10, June, 1964.

Speaking against the proliferation of such loose nomenclature, a former president of the American Association of Junior Colleges cites this condition as one of ten critical issues in education. He questions the use of such controversial words as "junior," "terminal," and "transfer." In their place he would suggest a new and understandable vocabulary that would eliminate the concept that education so different is inferior.[14]

If we were to look at the student as being an indicator of what describes higher education, we would find that he is recognized in the literature as being the "newest" member of the upper group.[15] Cross[16] points out that it is only the socio-economic background that differentiates the two-year college student from the four-year college student. The junior college student falls between the non-college and four-year college group on every index of sociometric status as determined by a recent study.[17]

The two-year college may still be considered in an experimental stage according to the National Education Association Committee on Standards.[18] This is especially significant in terms of the work it does and its correlation to the high schools on one hand and colleges and universities on the other. The Committee on Standards provides an excellent definition of the two-year college:

---

[14] Henry W. Littlefield, "Critical Issues Facing America's Junior Colleges," School and Society, 89:72, February, 1961.

[15] Cross, op. cit., p. 38.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Cross, op. cit., p. 39.

> The junior college is an institution of higher education which gives two years of work equivalent in prerequisites, scope, and thoroughness to the work done in the first two years of a college . . . .[19]

It is further recommended that admission should be based on graduation from a high school or its equivalence as approved by a recognized accrediting agency.[20]

Legal Nomenclature

Legislation often defines higher education within state boundaries. Legislative intent also has the capability of providing a standardized vocabulary relative to the two-year college movement. Unfortunately, little progress has been made in this area. Indeed, the legislation varies from state to state and legal interpretation is often based on financial or political control.

---

[18] Committee on Standards of the American Council of Education, "Standards and Principles for Accrediting Junior Colleges," *Educational Record*, 5:202, July, 1924.

[19] *Ibid.*

[20] *Ibid.*

For example, Education Code 22500 defines California public higher education as consisting of all public junior colleges, state colleges, and all campuses of the University of California. Elsewhere (as in Education Code Section 22650), the public junior colleges are defined as "secondary schools," and are within the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education which prescribes minimum standards for their formation and operation in addition to exercising general supervision over them.[21]

Prior to 1960, the junior colleges classified as secondary schools in California were unable to collect any tuition charges or fees since this would violate "free public education." Since 1960, fees have been collected for non-district students, health services, parking, and the student association which is a voluntary group.[22] This legally defined "secondary" status of the California junior colleges makes them tuition free. The state helps to finance the system as it does in the secondary schools using a formula based on average daily attendance and equalization aid, the latter varying with tax assessments on property.[23]

---

[21] Emil O. Toews, "The Present Status of Junior College Education in California," California Education, 2:13, May, 1965.

[22] Ibid., p. 14.

[23] Ibid.

Article XIII (A), a constitutional amendment in Oklahoma, defines the term higher education this way:

> . . . [It will] include all education of any kind _beyond or in addition_ to the twelfth grade or its _equivalent as that grade_ is now generally understood and accepted in the public schools in the state of Oklahoma. . . .[24]

Cross[25] argues that even if we were to agree on what constitutes institutions of secondary or higher education, each would have different tasks. If similar tasks were posed for all institutions of higher education, the junior college might then become a "watered-down version of the four-year college."[26]

Occupational and Vocational Terminology

A major problem in investigations dealing with occupational-vocational education and training is the semantics of the field. This is of special concern when one tries to differentiate between similar programs offered in the high schools and junior colleges. Science Research Associates, Inc., in a report dealing with the assessment of goals of vocational education, reported:

---

[24] E. T. Dunlap, "Oklahoma Looks to 1970," _Junior College Journal_, 39:32, February, 1969. (Emphasis supplied).

[25] K. Patricia Cross, "Higher Education's Newest Student," _Junior College Journal_, 39:42, September, 1968.

[26] _Ibid._

> First, there is the problem of what is meant by the term "vocational education." In its broadest sense, it could mean education preparatory to the entering of all occupations, both professional and non-professional, and thus encompass the entire educational process. In its narrowest sense, it could assume the meaning given to the term today in educational literature and refer only to those very precise courses of study found in most schools that prepare students for direct entry into a finite group of skilled occupations . . . the literature provides no help on this problem of definition; rather, it reflects the lack of consensus on the part of the "expert" writers . . . .[27]

Burt[28] defines the subject of industrial arts as a field of study in which the student is introduced to the use of techniques and devices which, with further training, will be useful to him in industrial employment. For example, the industrial arts student may learn something about drafting. However, his industrial arts training does not make him a draftsman. There is a wide difference between the study of industrial arts and vocational-technical education. The latter is designed to fit individuals into gainful employment as semi-skilled or skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations.[29] The problem here becomes one of recognizing a multitude of new occupations that seem to be created to fit the needs of a changing society.

---

[27] Samuel M. Burt, Industry and Vocational-Technical Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), pp. viii-ix, preface.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. x, preface.

[29] *Ibid.*

It is difficult to define what constitutes high school vocationalism and what constitutes junior college vocationalism. Each may offer similar curriculums in such areas as drafting, mechanics, secretarial practice, business, and nursing. To identify one as higher education and another as secondary education is extremely difficult, especially when the semantics of this field are employed. To be sure, there are many similarities and many differences in the vocational-occupational curriculums as offered in both the high schools and junior colleges, not to mention the distinct post-secondary public vocational schools. Consequently, the nomenclature of this field is ineffective as a means of identifying the junior college as being more closely aligned with secondary education or higher education.

State Department Nomenclature

Most State Departments of Education limit their definition of higher education to those institutions offering training above the twelfth grade whether it is of a college preparatory nature, terminal, or continuing education function.[30]

---

[30] A telephone interview with Oscar Jensen, Maryland State Teachers Association Consultant to the Higher Education Council, February 25, 1969.

However, all post-secondary schools need not fit this description. For example, a private trade school or secretarial school could indeed offer education beyond the period of high school to those who never previously completed or entered a high school. The determining factor is the necessity of a high school diploma or its equivalence to establish eligibility for higher education programs.[31] Further dismay is provoked when we learn that today it is incorrect to think of the community-junior college as a two-year institution. Many of its programs are either one, two, three, or more years in length.[32]

While a state may give acceptance to the two-year college as a member in a tripartite structure, it often does so with some uncertainty. The Maryland Council for Higher Education, as created by the 1963 Maryland General Assembly, found the problem of an appropriate system of collegiate education to keep reappearing in its plan for higher education. It recognized the present existence of a tripartite structure made up of the university, the state colleges, and the community colleges. The pressing problem is recognized as building this structure into a viable system of colleges. Accordingly, one of the Council's recommendations asks that "further creation of new public senior institutions or branches of existing public senior institutions be postponed until the planned community colleges are adequately developed and the plans of the private institutions can be ascertained."[33] This indicates that State Departments of Education are in need of further information if they are to aid junior college development.

---

[31] Jensen, supra.

[32] Jensen, supra.

Descriptive Nomenclature

Other methods of describing the two-year college employ the use of grades and years numbered as thirteen and fourteen. This method and its variations implicate the two-year college as an upward extension of the secondary schools and will be further pursued in Chapter IV.

Cole[34] describes the two-year college as that segment of higher education which will best be able to cope with "the higher education revolution and the exploding demands of the next decade." Among other descriptive nomenclature we find the two-year college labeled operationally to provide a "second chance,"[35] "salvage function,"[36] and a "cooling out function."[37]

---

[33] Maryland Association of Junior Colleges, "A Master Plan," *Digest, The Higher Education Journal of Maryland*, Higher Education Council, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Baltimore: Maryland State Teachers Association, February, 1969).

[34] *Newsletter*, Maryland Association of Junior Colleges, December, 1968.

Scannell, in expanding on an earlier-mentioned term, says "terminal" denotes both "those courses which are not equivalent to credit courses in four-year institutions and do not grant transfer credit."[38] He sees terminal students as those who, either by choice or chance, will never matriculate at a four-year institution.[39] Hence, the term "non-transfer" is preferred to "terminal" in the light of its undesirable connotation.[40]

The descriptive literature referring to the identification of the two-year college is very poetic, ranging from undesirable connotations to names such as technical institutes, seminaries, city colleges, junior, community, community-junior, or just plain college.[41] For example, the terms "community college" and "county college" are synonomous in New Jersey.[42] California employs the terms "unified" or "district" in its legal definition of two-year colleges, even though these institutions use a more simple designation such as El Camino College. These and other descriptive titles are often misleading and do not help to identify the two-year college as a distinct institution of secondary education or higher education.

---

[35] C. S. Locks, "Academic Performance of Students Transferring to Los Angeles Valley College from Two and Four Year Institutions" (unpublished report, Los Angeles Valley College, 1965).

[36] S. J. Muck, "Analysis of Records of Students Entering El Camino College from Other Institutions" (unpublished report, El Camino College, 1965).

[37] Lora S. Simon, "The Cooling Out Function of the Junior College," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 45:973-978, June, 1967.

[38] William J. Scannell, "What Do Teachers Think About English in the Two-Year College?" Junior College Journal, 37:25, September, 1966.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Ibid., p. 26.

Summary and Implications for This Study

In seeking to determine the relative status of the two-year college as an institution of secondary education or higher education, it becomes necessary to understand what constitutes each of these divisions. High schools are easily defined as institutions offering at least a twelfth grade of instruction. Education thereafter is best referred to as

---

[41] Erwin Knoll, "The Maturing of the Junior College," National Education Association Journal, 50:27-29, February, 1961.

[42] Angelo C. Gillie, "New Jersey Community Colleges: A Report and Prognosis," Junior College Journal, 38:34-37, November, 1967.

[illegible] which, in turn, may include higher education [illegible] need not. Consequently, junior college offerings [illegible] considered [illegible] "secondary" level [illegible], [illegible] Such [illegible] status [illegible] problems for the two-year colleges. [illegible] on may now include the offerings of the two-year col- [illegible] whereas it formerly referred exclusively to [illegible] [illegible]-year colleges and universities.

The term "two-year college" [illegible] used in the [illegible] and also denotes the community and junior colleges. It is considered an institution of higher education in those states that legally define higher education to be inclusive of the twelfth grade. It is also an institution of higher education in those states which legislate [illegible] junior college offerings as collegiate. However, some states legally define the junior college as an integral part of the [illegible] school system, thus still giving it a secondary [illegible] status.

"Vocational-occupational" training is offered in both the high schools and junior colleges. The overlap of industrial arts and vocational-technical training is a serious problem for junior colleges to overcome. Too often this area is interpreted in a similar fashion for both the high school and two-year college. As such, it allows this aspect of the two-year college movement to be a secondary education function.

However, the terminology describing this "vocational education" function of the two-year college is mainly defined within the aims and purposes of the present higher education systems. A lack of conformity with reference to the terminology of collegiate and higher education only serves to cloud the relative position and identity of the two-year college. Consequently, such nomenclature is ineffective in identifying the two-year college as an institution of secondary education or as an institution of higher education.

[illegible]

[illegible] changes [illegible]

[illegible] that, [illegible]

[illegible] of distinct [illegible]

[illegible] college [illegible]

[illegible] it is felt that [illegible]

[illegible] period has [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] period from the [illegible]

[illegible] importance to this study.

[illegible] an attempt is made to define the two-year [illegible] contemporary scene, it must be noted that [illegible] description of the past is still not available [illegible] reference to the earliest two-year college. One junior [illegible] for example, displays a sign which reads "Founded 1831" as an indication of its early existence.[1] However, the American Council on Education lists the oldest publicly supported junior college still in existence to have been founded in 1901 at Joliet, Illinois.[2] Gleazer[3] also denotes Joliet as the prototype institution that began the junior college movement. Toews,[4] however, states that the first junior college was established in 1902 when Chicago found it necessary to separate the general education program in the first two years from the more specialized junior and senior program of the university. This aspect would tend to identify the junior college as a product or modification of higher education.

Eells, a former Executive Secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges, states: "[What] might be called the earliest junior college is to be found at Newton, Maryland, where the first Catholic 'college' in what is now the United States was opened in 1677."[5] Eells[6] goes on to report that the first junior college in the United States still in existence as a junior college is Decatur Baptist College which was founded in Texas in 1897. Reynolds[7] confirms this, noting that Decatur Baptist College was founded as a junior college in contrast with earlier claims of others which were set up to be theological seminaries.

---

[1] "Emphasis," Junior College Journal, 39:3, February, 1969.

[2] An Introduction to American Junior Colleges, Reprinted from American Junior Colleges, Seventh Edition (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967), p. 4.

[3] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Junior Colleges: An Introduction (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1963), p. 4.

[4] Emil O. Toews, "Janus Looks at the Junior College," California Education, 1:7, January, 1964.

Hillway[8] says that, technically, the Negro colleges were the very first junior colleges operating in America; actually dating back before 1896. Graham[9] reports that the oldest junior college is Marion Institute, a member of the Alabama Association of Junior Colleges, having been founded in 1842.

At a later date, Eells[10] suggests that the oldest junior college is the privately owned Lasell Junior College in Massachusetts which was established in 1851 as Lasell Female Seminary. Stanley[11] reports that Lasell was founded in 1851, which was forty-five years before President William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago coined the term "junior college."

---

[5] W. C. Eells, The Junior College (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press, 1931), p. 57.

[6] Ibid., p. 64.

[7] James W. Reynolds, "We're Mighty Proud of Junior," National Education Association Journal, 42:212-213, April, 1953.

[8] Tyrus Hillway, The American Two Year College (New York City: Harper and Brothers, 1958), p. 39.

[9] Walter A. Graham, "It May Happen in Alabama, Too!" Junior College Journal, 35:28-29, November, 1964.

[10] W. C. Eells, Present Status of Junior College Terminal Education (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941), p. 20.

From its inception, Lasell offered a complete curriculum which included two years of post-secondary school work that was definitely on the college level.[12] Lasell also started with what amounted to a high school department--lower grades that prepared its students for the upper school. The lower grades were always subordinate and were dropped in the 1940's.[13] Nonetheless, such an organizational pattern identifies this institution as being closely aligned with the secondary schools acting more or less in a preparatory school function.

Dr. Wilson, former President of the University of Baltimore, examined the situation and concluded:

---

[11] James W. Stanley, "The Oldest Junior College," Junior College Journal, 36:37-38, November, 1965.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

> The parallelism between the offerings at Williams College (where Edward Lasell was a former professor) and Lasell Seminary is obvious. The parallelism between the offerings at Mt. Holyoke and at Lasell is likewise evident, both institutions attempting to offer the courses which were most essential to the higher education of young women . . .
>
> From the above evidence, it is clear that Lasell Seminary was offering in fact, though not in name, two years of junior college work in 1852, and, therefore, presumably in 1851. It has continued to offer two years of post-high school instruction to the present day. Not until 1932, however, was the name changed to Lasell Junior College. The change was then made by action of the Legislature of Massachusetts . . .
>
> Three conclusions are inescapable: (1) In 1851, Lasell Female Seminary was offering two years of instruction in advance of high school; (2) In 1851, Lasell Female Seminary was organized as a four-year unit which integrated the last two years of high school and the first two years of college; and (3) By 1874 Lasell Seminary was emphasizing the Terminal Cultural Curriculum.[14]

Another candidate for the prototype institution is Vincennes University (Indiana) who, prior to the 1880's, announced in its catalog a broadening of its then preparatory function:

> Our course of study is designed to meet the needs of those who desire a thorough, practical, and liberal education, and who yet do not have the desire or opportunity of spending four years in a collegiate course . . . . Anyone so desiring it can enter advanced classes in any college, after thoroughly completing the course.[15]

---

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[15] "Letters," *Junior College Journal*, 36:48, February, 1966.

The catalog for 1884-1885 stated:

> The certificate of work completed here will enable graduates of our classical course to enter the Junior Class of any State University without examination.[16]

The 1899 catalog issued under President Albert H. Yoder reads:

> The Vincennes University occupies a unique position in the educational field. It is halfway between a commissioned high school and a full-fledged college; it is, in fact, a junior college. Its graduates are admitted to junior standing in all the best universities . . . .[17]

As a candidate for the first junior college, Vincennes University placed itself in the transition area between the high school and senior college. As such, it would best be identified as a unique institution in its own right. This relative position is very common to the present status of the two-year college.

The Two-Year College Viewed in the Light of Secondary Schools

Most references in this early period show the two-year college as an upward extension of the high school. McLane[18] describes it outright as an "upward extension." The *Educational Review* reported that the plan of building the "so-called junior college" upon the high schools was becoming very popular by

---

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] C. L. McLane, "The Junior College, or Upward Extension of the High School," *The School Review*, 21:161-170, March, 1913.

1915.[19]

Koos[20] argues that two years were insufficient for a separate educational unit. He reported several considerations favoring its firm integration with high schools. These include an increased efficiency in instruction, economy of time, closely knitted curriculums, and less overlapping and duplication of services and efforts.[21] It becomes apparent that the early two-year college was indeed more closely related to the secondary schools in the light of its curriculum, purpose, and method of instruction during this period.

Most educators agree that college work seems to have first appeared in some high schools of Michigan and Minnesota.[22] It was under the leadership of Dr. A. F. Lange, Dean of the School of Education (University of California), that "the extension of high school" had its greatest impact in California.[23] The reason for this success is partially due to the large size of the State of California and the great distances from the then two universities, located at Berkeley and at Palo Alto.

---

[19] "The Junior College," Educational Review, 49:215, February, 1915.

[20] Leonard V. Koos, "Conditions Favoring Integration of Junior College with High Schools," School Life, 12:161-164, May, 1927.

[21] Ibid.

[22] A. A. Gray, "The Junior College in California," The School Review, 23:465, April, 1915.

[23] Ibid.

Dean Alexis Lange of the University of California favored having the junior college defined as a part of secondary education.[24] There was a conviction that secondary education began too late and ended too soon.[25] This was a common basis for support as subscribed to by the universities.

Such historical evidence as presented here has long since merged into ever-changing patterns. The conception of the two-year college as the culmination of the American secondary school is not of recent origin.[26] In its first stages it seems to have been an upward extension of the high school without a line of demarcation between the two levels of training.[27]

The Influence of Henry Phillips Tappan. One of the first American leaders of higher education to bring in the idea of reorganization along the lines of the European plan was Henry Phillips Tappan, former President of the University of Michigan. As early as 1851, he proposed a plan which had features of the German university as its model.[28] In particular, he stressed the feature of the student being prepared at the Gymnasium before being permitted to enter the University.[29] He further suggested that this preparatory function become the responsibility of the secondary school.

---

[24] Edward A. Krug, The Shaping of the American High School (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 443.

[25] Emil O. Toews, "Janus Looks at the Junior College," California Education, 1:7-8, 10, June, 1964.

[26] Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College, Research Publication of The University of Minnesota, Education Series, No. 5, (Minneapolis, Minnesota: 1924), p. 342.

[27] Ibid.

The Influence of William Watts Folwell. Another influential leader was William Watts Folwell, former President of the University of Minnesota, who, in his 1869 inaugural address, suggested the following:

> [Relegate to the secondary schools] . . . those studies which now form the body of work for the first two years in our ordinary American colleges. It is clear that such a transposition must by and by be made. How immense the gain . . . if a youth could remain at the high school or academy, residing in his home, until he had reached a point, say, somewhere near the end of the sophomore year . . . then . . . emigrate to the university, there to enter upon the work of a man . . .[30]

---

[28] Henry P. Tappan, _University in Education_ (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1851).

[29] _Ibid_.

[30] W. W. Folwell, _University Addresses_ (Minneapolis, Minnesota: H. W. Wilson Company, 1909), pp. 37-38.

Subsequently, President Folwell worked out a plan in harmony with his conception of the secondary schools taking a greater burden of the work load from the universities, an idea later raised in support of the establishment of junior colleges. Here again he reverts to the European organization of the junior college:

> While American experience formed the guide and principle of the arrangement under discussion, that of foreign countries, in which education has been authoritatively organized could not be left out of account. The new secondary department will be found to correspond in location, in object, and in scope, with the gymnasia and real schools of Germany and the lyceums of France and Switzerland. Upon this point I am happy in having the conclusive testimony of President McCosh . . . who says, "The course of instruction in the gymnasia and real schools . . . embraces not only the branches taught in our high schools, but those taught in the freshman and sophomore classes of our university courses." My own observation not long before, brought me to the same conclusion in substance . . . .[31]

Folwell goes on to ask for high schools of more generous scope than ever before and affirms that "the work of the first two years of college is the work of the secondary school, and there it can be done most efficiently and economically."[32] His plans were subsequently put aside by later administrators, probably because they were too far advanced for that period.

---

[31] Ibid., pp. 103-104.

[32] Ibid., pp. 108-109.

William Rainey Harper and School Reorganization. Speaking on reorganization of our system of schools, President William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago gives an early account and proposition for the two-year college:

> The principle that the line of separation at the close of the second college year is much more closely marked, pedagogically, than the line at the close of the present high school period.[33]

To extend the work of the high school to include the first two years of college apparently was a part of "the practice, [then] in common vogue, of making the first two years of college work only an extension of the work in the secondary school," according to Harper.[34] With some hesitation, he cites a "fear that the college idea would be injured by the rivalry of the new *high school colleges*."[35]

It is of interest to note that in describing those junior colleges within high schools, Angell makes use of the terms "junior college high schools" and "junior college schools."[36] Such notations are descriptive of the secondary status of the two-year college during this period.

---

[33] William Rainey Harper, "The High School of the Future," *The School Review*, 11:1-3, January, 1903.

[34] *Ibid*.

[35] *Ibid*. (Emphasis supplied).

[36] James R. Angell, "The Junior-College Movement in High Schools," *The School Review*, 23:293, May, 1915.

Leonard V. Koos and a General Line of Demarcation. On a more general level, Koos[37] was one of the first educators who sought a clearer differentiation between secondary schools, colleges, and universities. In seeking a natural line of demarcation, it is useful to refer to his study published in 1924. Table I presents a comparison of secondary school, college, and university aims.

An analysis of Koos' study reveals that the secondary school and college aims have much more in common than do the college and university aims. There are ten purposes recognized for the college, which are unrecognized among university purposes. If, then, these statements concerning aims of the three units under consideration are valid, the aims of college and secondary school somewhat define a line of demarcation falling more naturally at the end of the college period than at its beginning.

If the two-year college were to be considered in the light of Koos' study, its relative position would lie somewhere between the more common aims of the high schools and colleges. The two-year college is not expected to share the more critical aims established for universities. It is also

---

[37] Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College, Research Publication of The University of Minnesota, Educational Series, No. 5, (Minneapolis, Minnesota: 1924), p. 371.

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF SECONDARY SCHOOL, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY AIMS

1924

Aims and Functions Calling For Values In:	Secondary School %	College %	University %
General or Liberal Training	61-80	61-80	21-40
Training for Life's Needs	21-40	21-40	0
Civic-Social Responsibility	81-100	61-80	1-20
Morality and Character	61-80	61-80	0
Religious Training	41-60	21-40	0
Domestic Responsibility	21-40	1-20	0
Training and Leadership	1-20	21-40	21-40
Recreational and Aesthetic Aspects of Life	81-100	1-20	0
Occupational Efficiency	81-100	21-40	61-80
Physical Efficiency	61-80	1-20	0
Intellectual Efficiency	21-40	1-20	1-20
Mental Discipline	1-20	21-40	1-20
Democratic School System	61-80	1-20	0
Recognizing Individual Differences	81-100	1-20	0
Exploration and Guidance	41-60	1-20	1-20
Selection for Higher Education	1-20	1-20	1-20
Preliminary Training	61-80	21-40	0
Recognizing Adolescence	41-60	0	0
Training in Fundamental Processes	21-40	1-20	0
Community or Public Service	1-20	1-20	1-20
Coordinating the Student's Knowledge	1-20	1-20	1-20
Knowledge for Its Own Sake	0	1-20	1-20
Developing Scholarly Interest and Ambition	0	21-40	1-20
Research	0	0	81-100
Instruction	0	0	41-60
Extension	0	0	21-40
Publication	0	0	21-40

to be noted that, at this time, four-year colleges did not share the status given to comparable institutions today. Therefore, such reasoning tends to associate the two-year college more closely with the lower echelon of high schools and colleges rather than with the higher education aspects of universities. However, as long as each other's functions tend to overlap in the case of colleges and secondary schools on one hand and the colleges and universities on the other, a more critical observation is limited from this study.

Organizational Patterns Involving the High School and Two-Year College

Organizational patterns at this time became a topic of controversy and in need of revision. Corbally[38] listed the organization of secondary education as one of the ten "critical" issues in American education. He writes:

> Will we have a 6-3-3; a 6-6; a 6-4-4, or some other plan? The legislature . . . legalized the upward extension of the high school to include the 13th and 14th years . . . [39]

For example, in Washington, the extension of the high schools to include grades thirteen and fourteen came four years after the 1941 legislature provided for the creation of public junior colleges in that state.[40] Little attempt was made to differentiate between secondary education and higher education at that time. Koos[41] favors six elementary and eight secondary grades arranged in a 6-4-4 pattern. He suggests that the middle four-year period be referred to as "junior high school" and the latter four-year period be identified as "senior high school" or "junior college."[42]

---

[38] John E. Corbally, "Some Critical Issues in Secondary Education," University of Washington College of Education Record, 12:18-19, December, 1945.

[39] Ibid.

Principal J. Stanley Brown of the Joliet (Illinois) Township High School reported that the first of the graduates from the six-year high school course had received his baccalaureate degree on the completion of only two years of additional work.[43] However, he states that this two-year addition to secondary schools is not desirable as a general modification of secondary schools.[44]

E. C. Pierce, Principal of Elgin (Illinois) High School, says:

---

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[41] Koos, *loc. cit.*

[42] *Ibid.*

[43] "Editorial Notes," *The School Review*, 14:609, October, 1906.

[44] *Ibid.*

> We must extend the courses of study, not downwards, but upwards to five and six years, while at the same time it should be maintained that the college course should begin where the present course of the strong high school now closes; this would be an extension of the free school two years beyond its present limit.[45]

Koos[46] cites one organizational pattern, the 6-3-3-2 plan, as a product of both downward and upward extensions of secondary education in the light of expanding curriculums. Another variation of extended secondary education is described by the high school principal of Saginaw (Michigan) East Side, who writes:

> For the past three years we have offered courses corresponding to freshman work at the University of Michigan in Latin . . . trigonometry and algebra . . . paragraph writing, and in English history. We have sent to Ann Arbor eight or ten students who have received sufficient credit for work done in our high school to enable them to complete their college courses in three years . . . . The work done in our graduate courses has been satisfactory to the University authorities.[47]

It was reported that high schools could do this work as well as the colleges and there was but a trivial difference between the last year of high school and the first year of college.[48] Indeed, a consensus showed that students were often disappointed in making the transition.[49] Tressler recognized the five or six-year courses of study in high schools but, due to the concomitant financial burdens, he labeled the idea as "impolite, unpopular and unwise."[50]

---

[45] E. C. Pierce, "Twenty-seventh Semi-Annual Meeting of The Michigan Schoolmasters' Club," The School Review, 5:120, February, 1897.

[46] Koos, op. cit., p. 164.

[47] E. C. Warriner, "Twenty-seventh Semi-Annual Meeting of The Michigan Schoolmasters' Club," The School Review, 5:127, February, 1897.

The National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools adopted (March 10, 1921) this report:

> The junior college is an institution covering the first two years of a standard college course, based upon the completion of four years of high school work. It may be a division of a large university . . . it may be a separate institution . . . it may be a graduate annex to a local high school organized primarily to gratify local pride or to aggrandize the local school system . . . . It must ordinarily be a separate institution, with its own building, its own president, and its own faculty . . . . The method of instruction should be collegiate rather than secondary, and the atmosphere should be the same.
>
> The extension of a high school course by the addition of one or two years of more advanced work may meet a genuine local need, but such an annex to a high school is not necessarily worthy of collegiate standing. In general it may be said that such an institution with the high school principal becoming the president of the college, with certain of the high school teachers taking over the work of instruction, and carrying it on with

---

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid.

[50] A. W. Tressler, "Twenty-seventh Semi-Annual Meeting of The Michigan Schoolmasters' Club," The School Review, 5:123, February, 1897.

> the high school facilities, does not deserve to be called a college and should not be recognized as such.[51]

Apparently, the two-year college concept, while gaining momentum as a desirable innovation, was not to be a general modification for all secondary schools. Four-year colleges had not yet experienced the impact of mass education. At this time, only one out of four who entered college would even earn a degree.[52]

As an aid in determining the relative status of the two-year college, Bolton proposed that a 6-4-4 plan be utilized to assist the junior college in making a proper adjustment.[53] He says, "This would effect an earlier and closer integration of the elementary, secondary and higher grades . . ."[54]

A redistribution of institutional jurisdiction was called for by Angell who suggested the 6-4-4-2+ organizational plan as an opportunity.[55] The first six years were to include the elementary grades; the next four-year period was to be "junior high school," followed by a four-year continuation called "college;" the last two years being in preparation for professional schools or the doctorate. The reasoning supplied to defend such a position tends to associate the two-year college more closely with the high school:

---

[51] Committee on Standards of The American Council of Education, "The Junior College," Educational Record, 2:68-69, April, 1921.

[52] Frederick E. Bolton, "Some Probable Effects Upon Higher Education Due to the Development of Junior Colleges," Educational Administration and Supervision, 5:85-93, February, 1919.

[53] Frederick E. Bolton, "Suggestions for the Post-War Development of Junior Colleges," University of Washington College of Education Record, 10:92, April, 1944.

[54] *Ibid.*

[55] James R. Angell, "Problems Peculiar to the Junior College," The School Review, 25:394, June, 1917.

> . . . the period at which junior-college training is completed under ordinary conditions represents a more strategic line of division than either that at the end of the present high school or that at the end of the present four-year college.[56]

An example of a six-year high school which included the first two years of college was established between the University of Chicago and Goshen (Indiana) High School.[57] Terms were set up whereby advanced standing was given to successful high school graduates. This plan incorporated the junior college concept completely within the high school system. Teachers, courses, examinations, and visitations were to be under university control while paid for by the high school.[58] This arrangement did not receive much support but is significant insofar as it represents the effort of the four-year college to establish its own influence on the two-year college. That the high school would assume greater responsibility for expanding its service was a constant challenge. President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia writes:

---

[56] Ibid., p. 395.

[57] Victor W. B. Hedgepeth, "The Six Year High School Plan at Goshen, Indiana," The School Review, 13:22, January, 1905.

[58] Ibid.

> As the public high schools multiply and strengthen they will tend more and more to give the instruction now offered in the first year or first two years of the college course . . . they will become local colleges . . . without student residences.[59]

In agreement, Bolton says:

> The first two years of college and university work are confessedly a part of secondary education. The boys and girls are of secondary school age and must be dealt with by secondary school methods, no matter where they are.[60]

President Alexander Meiklejohn of Amherst College provides a philosophical and satirical view on the function of "college" as being distinct from the high school, the professional school, and the university.[61] His perplexities would be heightened indeed if he were to "fit in" one additional comparison; namely, the two-year college. He emphatically states that there is a limit to the number of things a single thing can be.[62]

---

[59] Bolton, *loc. cit.*

[60] *Ibid.*

[61] *The American College*, A Series of Papers Setting Forth the Program, Achievements, Present Status, and Probable Future of the American College (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1915), pp. 147-169.

Some concern has been raised about spreading financial resources too thin with reference to support of the two-year college. Zook[63] doesn't think that its establishment will have an adverse effect on the amount of money available for elementary and secondary schools. He writes:

> . . . junior college education would be established in the closest possible correlation with the local high schools of every community . . . the administration, teaching personnel, and physical facilities of the two would be knit together in a close correlation which would do away with the duplication of subject matter and misgivings now existing between [them] . . .[64]

While this statement was appropriate to the 1930's, it is much less popular today.

The Two-Year College Viewed in the Light of Four-Year Colleges

Many efforts were made on behalf of the two-year college by senior colleges and universities. These efforts were most often independent of those made by the secondary schools. It will be shown that the basic aims for establishing the two-year college were different for the senior colleges. This difference of purpose is presented as identifying various aspects of the early junior college movement with higher education.

---

[62] *Ibid.*

[63] George F. Zook, "The Junior College in the State's Program of Education," *National Education Association Proceedings*, 68:560-562, June 28-July 4, 1930.

[64] *Ibid.*

The first twenty years of junior college development gave foundation to three basic types:

1. Private: Church or religious groups. About one hundred, which represented seventy-five percent of the total.
2. Public: A part of secondary school systems; often known as junior and senior years as opposed to the previous high school years in grades eleven and twelve known as the freshman and sophomore years. Most of these units were housed within high schools with varying degrees of separation of teacher-administration, student body, and social life. Exceptions were to be found in Kansas City, Missouri, and Grand Rapids, Michigan, where the junior college is some distance from high school units.
3. State Institutions: By 1924 there were at least six universities (University of California, Chicago, Washington, Minnesota, Leland Stanford Junior University, and the University of Nebraska) that reorganized by creating two-year colleges.

> Three called it a "lower division," two called it a "junior college," and one named it a "junior division."[65]

While the first of these three types is considered incidental to this study, the second is in direct support of the early two-year college as an upward extension of the secondary schools. The junior college, initiated by university support, is in direct contrast and identifies the two-year institution as a lower or downward extension of the university. It is proper to view the two-year college movement in both phases; that is, some initiated by the secondary schools, and others sponsored by four-year colleges and universities.

Accommodations were made within institutions of higher education to include lower divisions identified as junior colleges. There was a recognized cleavage within such universities to provide for many three-year curriculum offerings. This combined arts-professional curriculum included arts-engineering, arts-medicine, arts-law, etc.

Arrangements provided also for a fourth year to be taken in a professional school or technical school, either at the original university or elsewhere. Also, such a plan encouraged both two and three-year pre-professional curriculums in business, agriculture, law, medicine, nursing, dentistry, journalism, forestry, and theology. These curriculums were general and were offered without announced affiliation. There existed more than one hundred ninety departments bearing professional names and offering varied courses in agriculture, commerce, secretarial training, journalism, home economics, and law, etc. Some departments offered only a few courses of an applied sort while others included extensive offerings. Hence, these were also accommodations to the desires and needs of those who wanted non-occupational collegiate education less than four years in length.[66]

---

[65] Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College Movement (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1925), pp. 8-10, 219.

It is suggested that the student was able to complete a liberal training period in two or three years and then transfer to a professional school, and also that professional studies were shifted into the upper end of the four-year period of college education. It is appropriate here to suggest that this liberalization movement and its shift to vocationally-oriented curriculums were factors that stressed the necessity of organizing "lower" colleges and, in fact, this would tend to intensify the already established line of cleavage providing more substance to the junior college movement.

---

[66] *Ibid.*, pp. 214-218.

In the 1880's, the University of Michigan undertook to establish, within its own confines, a distinction between university work and college work. Angell[67] reports the results of an appropriate questionnaire sent to nineteen universities, seven colleges, and eleven high schools with junior college departments. A majority of the universities granted credit for "fifth and sixth-year work done in the high school."[68] In no case was there any indication to support "definite relations with junior colleges based on high-school foundations.[69] Apparently, the university-independent based institutions were favored at this time in the central and western parts of the United States. This early form of two-year college was initiated and controlled by universities within the physical confines of the secondary schools. California, more than other states, seemed to favor those junior colleges based on high school foundations.

President James of the University of Illinois suggested a lower division reorganization along the lines of junior colleges.[70] It must be noted here that these projects had no direct relation to the high schools or separate institutions called junior colleges. They were actually reorganized subdivisions of the university, which, in effect, were equivalent to distinct two-year colleges.

---

[67] James R. Angell, "The Junior-College Movement in High Schools," The School Review, 23:293, May, 1915.

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 291.

[69] *Ibid.*

President Harper, in planning for the University of Chicago, clearly indicated his belief that the small college should either die or become a junior college offering freshman and sophomore work only.[71] According to McConaughy:

> The idea of a college offering only a two-year course has been welcomed on these western prairies; here has developed the junior college attached to the high school . . . here a state university has effected an arrangement whereby nearly a score of colleges--ill-equipped and ill-endowed--have been transformed into junior colleges, whose students attend the state university for their junior and senior years.[72]

Harper is often credited for coining the expression "junior college" which, according to Krug, effectively does away with the connotation that the two years beyond the twelfth grade were a part of the high school movement.[73]

---

[70] Ibid., pp. 292-293.

[71] James L. McConaughy, "The Future of the College in the Middle West," School and Society, 9:607-613, May, 1919.

[72] Ibid., p. 607.

[73] Edward A. Krug, The Shaping of the American High School (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 443.

Angell explains that the junior college of the University of Chicago was instituted in the belief that a rather sharp break could be made between secondary and university studies; the former representing closely supervised routine forms of work, and the latter emphasizing "free, specialized, professional, and research work."[74] Curriculums of all junior colleges were reported to be comparable regardless of whether they were built upon high school foundations, independent foundations, or differentiated parts of the modern university.[75]

The junior college that carried on in a geographic separation from the senior college was apt to find the disadvantage of losing stimulation and outlook.[76] However, there were several advantages to such an arrangement: (1) There was a greater esprit de corps. (2) It was easier to secure a more qualified type of instructor. (3) Separating high school students from junior college students brought about a more conducive college tone.[77] Nonetheless, when the high school and junior college were together, the student was encouraged to go forward; teachers found it easier to understand problems arising at each level; and there was no sharp intellectual change noted when entering the junior college from the high school.[78]

---

[74] James R. Angell, "Problems Peculiar to the Junior College," The School Review, 25:386, June, 1917.

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 385.

[76] *Ibid.*, pp. 389-390.

[77] *Ibid.*, pp. 391-392.

Another example of the two-year college being a product of downward intervention on behalf of the universities was set by the University of California in establishing the University Junior College. Its main function was to aid high school graduates whose requirements were below standard university entrance requirements.[79]

Dr. Touton, Vice-President of the University of Southern California and the Director of the University Junior College, said in part:

> . . . The success of the first year's operation of the plan shows that many high school graduates previously denied admission to college should be given an opportunity to study college subjects under controlled college conditions, in a college campus environment characterized by encouragement, motivation and use of effective study methods before final judgment can be reached as to promise of achievement on the college level.[80]

Gray sees the successful growth of the two-year college in California to be a part of national reorganization.[81] He writes in part:

---

[78] Ibid.

[79] "Educational Events," School and Society, 41:328, March, 1935.

[80] Ibid.

> . . . it is not simply a branch grafted arbitrarily on the state school system to be heralded forth as a new educational device . . . Neither is the junior college merely an educational adjunct appended to the four-year high school . . . nor just a feeder for the universities.[82]

Wilbur[83] views the early two-year college as serving the function of a "shock absorber" between the high schools and four-year colleges. Magruder[84] sees it as offering "relief" to the universities.

The junior college, as organized in 1929, was described as serving the need for a "people's vocational college" in addition to supplanting the lower division of universities.[85] Indeed, terminal education was described as the most important concern of the junior college worthy of mention.[86] More than two-thirds of those who began a junior college education would not go beyond two years.[87]

---

[81] A. A. Gray, "The Junior College in California," The School Review, 23:468, April, 1915.

[82] Ibid., p. 470.

[83] R. L. Wilbur, "The Junior College--A Message," Sierra Educational News, 23:147, 1926.

[84] William T. Magruder, "The Junior College as Relief," Educational Review, 61:286-297, April, 1921.

[85] G. M. Okerlund, "Junior College Graduates in the Universities," School and Society, 29:676-677, May, 1929.

[86] "Educational Events," School and Society, 50:432, September, 1939.

Gray affirms that "it is not just advanced high school work" that constitutes the function of the two-year college.[88] Consequently, we are led to believe that the institution has had notable relationships with both secondary and higher education. Furthermore, this makes its proper identity difficult to detect.

Thus, it is demonstrated that the early two-year college was indeed an institution of secondary education on one hand and higher education on the other. The early literature supports both aspects to various degrees. Relatively speaking, however, early influences support the contention that the two-year college is more closely identified with the secondary schools in this period.

Formative Legislation Affecting the Status of the Two-Year College

A brief account of formative legislation is presented in the light of its influence on the relative status of the two-year college. It is noted that some legislative effects actually denote the junior college as a secondary education institution while others clearly identify it with higher education.

---

[87] Ibid.

[88] Gray, op. cit., p. 472.

Typical of the point being made here is the following reference by Bolton:

> One of the great difficulties in the establishment and support of junior colleges has been the question of *whether they are a part of the public school system or a part of higher educational institutions.* Each state should settle that decisively and either classify them as public schools or as higher educational institutions. If they are public schools [then] they should be financed . . . in precisely the same way as elementary and secondary schools. If they belong with the higher educational institutions their maintenance [should be comparable to state universities].[89]

Early legislation left its imprint on the two-year college in those states that found it necessary to legally clarify the status of these institutions. Emphasis is placed on California which is selected for its quality of leadership in the educational field.

Secondary Status in California. In 1907, the California Legislature authorized the addition of two years of postgraduate education to the existing secondary high schools.[90] The high schools were empowered to offer freshman and sophomore level courses comparable to those in the four-year institutions.[91] Fresno High School offered postgraduate classes in 1910 thus becoming the first public junior college in California.[92] Fresno City College, under the leadership of Superintendent Charles L. McLane and Principal Albert Clyde Olney, is considered to be the second oldest American junior college in continuous operation (next to Joliet Junior College in Illinois). Olney started other such programs in various high schools, and in 1929 he became the first President of The Junior College Federation, now called The California Junior College Association.[93]

---

[89] Frederick E. Bolton, "Suggestions for the Post-War Development of Junior Colleges," *University of Washington College of Education Record*, 10:91-92, April, 1944. (Emphasis supplied).

[90] Emil O. Toews, "Janus Looks at the Junior College," *California Education*, 1:7, June, 1964.

By 1917, statutes authorized the establishment of "junior college" departments within the high schools with the obligation to offer postgraduate classes.[94] At that time there were eighteen high schools involved with such programs.[95] In 1915, the Attorney General of California ruled that school districts were ineligible to receive state aid for post-high school courses.[96] This caused the Commissioner of Secondary

---

[91] Gerald D. Cresci and Carl G. Winter, "The Junior College As A Partner In Higher Education," California Schools, 34:31, February, 1963.

[92] Ibid.; Toews, loc. cit.

[93] Toews, loc. cit.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Emil O. Toews, "California Leads with Many Firsts in Junior College Education," California Education, 1:19, January, 1964.

[96] Ibid.

Schools, Will C. Wood, in 1916, to suggest that junior colleges receive financial support based on average daily attendance (as in the high schools), thus opening the way for state aid.[97]

A special committee appointed by the 1919 Legislature recommended reorganization of the entire educational system in the state.[98] It proposed that university education should begin at the junior year within a group of professional schools of which the university was composed; all the normal schools (which were two-year colleges) were to be converted into four-year colleges with junior college departments. However, it also proposed establishing the 6-3-3-2 organizational pattern in which the two-year college would be established and maintained by independent junior college districts.[99]

The 1921 Legislature authorized independent junior college districts and by 1926 there were thirty-one junior colleges, of which sixteen were departments in high schools, six were attached to state colleges, and the remaining nine were in independent junior college districts.[100]

---

[97] Ibid.

[98] Emil O. Toews, "Janus Looks at the Junior College," California Education, 1:7-8, June, 1964.

[99] Ibid.

[100] Ibid.

By 1935, the junior colleges had expanded their role beyond that of preparing students with transfer courses. Vocational, technical, and general education courses were offered to meet ever-changing local needs. Thus, the junior colleges were, in effect, becoming "community" colleges.

In 1940, the junior colleges were legally an integral part of the public school system in which the youth were entitled to "be educated at public expense."[101] Even laboratory fees and school supplies were to be furnished free to all students from the kindergarten through the junior college.

Bolton affirms a secondary education status for the two-year college by noting the following:

> . . . [according to the California School Code] each junior college shall provide for the education of pupils in the thirteenth and fourteenth grades and for the education of such adults and minors as may properly be admitted but who are not classifiable by grade . . . The courses of study for two year junior colleges shall be designed to fit the needs of pupils in the thirteenth and fourteenth grade . . . .[102]

It was not until the period after 1948 that the California two-year college was identified as an institution of higher education. For example, the Strayer Study of 1948 reported that the junior college has a unique function in

---

[101] "Fees, Charges and Deposits in California Public Schools," California Schools, 11:25, May, 1940.

[102] Bolton, *loc. cit.*

[illegible] ation. [illegible]

[illegible] ned [illegible]

[illegible] later a [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible] education, [illegible]

[illegible] was not until twelve [illegible]

[illegible] when a Master Plan for [illegible]

[illegible] college was clearly [illegible]

[illegible] ation.[104] The Master Plan also [illegible]

[illegible] the two-year college to be that of [illegible]

[illegible] programs in higher education.[105]

[illegible]

[illegible] The 1947 legislature [illegible]

[illegible] C. Toews, "California Deals with [illegible] Education," California Education, [illegible]

[104] [illegible] and Winter, op. cit., p. 37.

[105] Ibid.

permitted state and local funds to be used in supporting the community-junior colleges as well as grades one through twelve.[106] Establishing and maintaining junior colleges was still a local responsibility primarily vested in Boards of Education. Therefore, while the two-year college was taking a foothold in Florida, it still maintained vital ties with the secondary education system.

It was during the period 1947--1957, that two additional two-year colleges were established and the Council for the Study of Higher Education recommended the establishment of a Community College Council to develop long-range plans.[107] A comprehensive plan was sent to the 1957 Legislature in which local initiative was still retained as the basis for development so that ultimately 99 percent of the population was to be within commuting distance of a two-year college.

Not until the more recent period, 1957--1967, were twenty-eight community-junior colleges established under coordinated plans for higher education. Also, in this period, state influence and development were more noticeable and planning was coordinated with the other institutions of higher education.

---

[106] Floyd T. Christian and James L. Wattenburger, "Two Years--A Plan Evolves in Florida," _Junior College Journal_, 38:44-47, September, 1967.

[107] _Ibid_.

In the 1920's, Oklahoma legislation permitted local school districts to establish the "thirteenth and fourteenth grades" of post-secondary education in conjunction with their high school programs.[108]

Most of Oklahoma's present junior colleges were established as preparatory schools for the university. Subsequently, when the need for preparatory schools diminished, the system of existing secondary schools became state junior colleges and four-year colleges. However, only one still enrolls high school students in connection with the junior college program.[109] These present two-year colleges heavily favor the college transfer program and do little with vocational education.

It was not until 1968 that legislation permitted the new two-year colleges of 1970 to be an "integral part" of the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.[110] Such a legal designation is considered beneficial to the general status of the junior colleges. It encourages a more rapid acceptance of the two-year college as an institution of higher education.

---

[108] E. T. Dunlap, "Oklahoma Looks to 1970," Junior College Journal, 39:29, February, 1969.

[109] Ibid.

[110] Ibid., p. 32.

In Washington, the junior college is rapidly making progress in exchanging a secondary education status for one of higher education. The process is not complete yet but typifies a common quest for status on behalf of all two-year colleges.

In 1939, Senate Bill 71 declared that the seven operating junior colleges and any new ones were to be a part of the higher education system of Washington.[111] Junior college districts that were coterminous with high school districts were to be operated under the high school board or, in the case of multi-districts, a separate five member board was elected.[112]

In 1945, the Washington Legislature passed House Bill 262 which authorized school districts to establish the thirteenth and fourteenth grades "as part of the common school system of the State and to pay for such programs out of their general fund budgets."[113] Thus, as a part of the common school system, a junior college would be eligible to be supported completely by local and State funds by way of a distribution formula.[114] Accordingly, Brouillet reveals that "it would seem safe to predict that the community colleges will attain complete independence from local school districts."[115] By seeking such independence, the Washington two-year college indicates its desire to attain a closer identification with higher education.

---

[111] Senate Bills, Washington State Legislature, Vol. 25, 1939.

[112] House Bills, Washington State Legislature, Vol. 20, 1927.

[113] House Bills, Washington State Legislature, Vol. 29, 1945.

Summary of the Early Influence on the Two-Year College

From this chapter it is concluded that the early two-year college had its origins as an offshoot of both secondary education and higher education. Such a genesis is difficult to understand in the light of present educational issues. During this formative period, little attempt was made to distinguish or identify the parent organization. The two-year college had a variety of chores and tasks to perform and the appropriate vehicle for this innovation proved to be satisfactory both in the secondary schools and the four-year colleges. Nevertheless, on a relative basis, the early two-year college offers more functional and characteristic implications in support of its closer alignment with the secondary schools. The need for a more erudite clarification of the junior college becomes apparent in contemporary education and will be pursued in the following chapters which further develop the problem of identity.

---

[114] Ibid.

[115] Frank B. Brouillet, "The Development of Financial Support for Washington State Community Colleges," University of Washington College of Education Record, 31:23, January, 1965.

CHAPTER V

A FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBLEM

(1940's--Present)

This chapter presents an analysis of the more recent state of affairs as they apply in identifying the two-year college as an institution of secondary education or higher education. It is found that these views often tend to be diametrically opposed to each other. Furthermore, it is noted that this development reveals subtle differences in the nature and character of the two-year college. As such, these subtleties are presented and analyzed to determine those which are most representative of the two-year college.

The Present Conflict: A Dual Status

The unresolved nature of the present two-year college is apparent to most educators. Its relative status in secondary and higher education is viewed by some to be a futile exercise in logic. Others, however, see its lack of status as a fundamental issue. The United States Office of Education recognizes this problem and asks:

> Are Public 2-Year Colleges Secondary or Higher Education? This question is repeatedly asked, sometimes by people who enjoy academic exercises and sometimes by people who really believe the question is a fundamental one. If the question is reworded to say, "Is a 2-year college a high school or a university?", the answer is simply, "Neither." . . . [some] 2-year colleges do include

> some work that is high school level in nature, as many universities did until recently and as a few still do . . . much study is needed to present a clear[er] picture of the image or the several images of 2-year colleges.[1]

Kelsey[2] sees the two-year college fulfilling the need for more semiprofessional education and terminal courses and identifies the junior college as being "higher" than high school but "lesser" than the four-year type of institution.

Castell[3] sees the two-year college as detaching the first two years from the liberal arts colleges and either using these years as a basis for operation _or_ seeking their attachment to the high schools. This middle of the road attitude tends to delay the inevitable task of identifying the two-year college more intelligently.

The dual status of the junior college is further noted by Gleazer who asks pointedly, "_Is the public junior_

---

[1] D. G. Morrison and S. V. Martorana, "Are Public 2-Year Colleges Secondary or Higher Education?" _State Formulas for the Support of Public 2-Year Colleges_, Office of Education, Bulletin 1962, No. 14 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962), p. 33. (Emphasis supplied).

[2] Roger B. Kelsey, "Independent State and Local Boards for Higher Education in Maryland," A discussion with Senator Royal Hart [Md.], AAUP Chapter, Catonsville Community College [Md.], May 9, 1968.

[3] Aubrey Castell, "Wanted: A New Deal for the Liberal Arts College," _University of Washington College of Education Record_, 22:18, January, 1956.

college more a part of secondary education or higher education?"[4] In identifying this "new social invention" he writes:

> The community college has its most productive development not when it is conceived of as the first two years of the baccalaureate degree program, nor when seen as grades thirteen or fourteen, but as an institution in its own right--a new kind of college--standing between the high school and university--offering broad programs of experiences of value--in and of themselves, neither post-high school as such or pre-college as such.[5]

This position identifies the community college as an institution that serves both secondary and higher education while still retaining its own unique identity. While the two-year college may indeed share a unique position in education, it is advantageous for the two-year college to seek a more firm identity of its own, one that clearly establishes its relationship with secondary or higher education.

Another method of determining the relative status of the two-year college involves the influence and demands of mass education. The public is making a real impact on the quantity and quality of education offered in this country. Priest[6] reports that half of the people in the United States are below average if we accept the mathematical definition of "average." Therefore, in order to function as a "people's college," the two-year college makes appropriate adjustments to this half.[7] This suggests a characteristic of the two-year college that makes it different from that of its four-year counterparts which generally cater to an upper strata within society.

---

[4] Norman L. Friedman, "Comprehensiveness and Higher Education: A Sociologist's View of Public Junior College Trends," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, 52:417, December, 1966. (Emphasis supplied).

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] Bill J. Priest, "On the Threshhold of Greatness," *Junior College Journal*, 37:6-8, September, 1966.

The public is confused about the relative status of the junior college. Friedman writes:

> The people will confuse junior college and junior high school. They hardly know what they are talking about sometimes. The newspaper consistently includes news of the junior college with the high school. I mean news from the junior college goes on a page with all the school news, from the grade schools up. Just a little paragraph about a rhythm band in one of the grade schools and a little paragraph next to it about the junior college.[8]

We are still uncertain about the novel role that the two-year college accepts. Referring to the American people, Gleazer writes:

> [They] have yet to figure out fully this junior college, which insists that it is not a high school (though it offers many programs similar to those in high schools), claims to be higher education (while teaching printing, welding, and data-processing), but is in many respects obviously unlike what the public have for years conceived higher education to be.[9]

---

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid., p. 419.

[9] Roger H. Garrison, "Unique Problems of Junior Colleges," National Education Association Journal, 56:30, November, 1967.

Concerning the relative status of the two-year college, Gleazer concludes:

> Most junior colleges are ambivalent about their status in education. Only within the last decade has the public junior college made a major shift from being grades 13 and 14 of a public school district to being an institution of higher education . . . Psychologically as well as operationally, the junior college heritage has been the elementary and secondary schools. But at the same time, the junior college aspires to be--drives urgently to be--a part of higher education.[10]

According to a noted sociologist, the two-year college has a "quest for status and identity differentiation" in American education today.[11] This search for identity is a current problem and, as such, is unfinished.[12] Consequently, its effect on this paper necessarily limits the decisiveness of citing the junior college as an institution of secondary or higher education. Rather, it permits one to observe the present trend and the relative tendency of the two-year college in becoming more firmly identified with either secondary or higher education.

The relative status of the two-year college is often misunderstood due to a lack of knowledge on the part of college professors according to Blocker.[13] He cites a statement by a former university professor to illustrate a degree of hostility toward the two-year college:

---

[10] Ibid.

[11] Friedman, op. cit., p. 418.

[12] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "Concerns and Cautions for Community College," Junior College Journal, 38:18-21, March, 1968.

> By way of summary, to establish an inferior institution whose faculty will be composed of high school teachers, because no first class scholar will teach in a junior college when he can secure employment in a first-class college or university, and whose courses of study will not prepare anyone to enter the University or fit him for life . . .
>
> Businessmen will not employ incompetent people. What is needed is for parents to send their boys and girls who have failed in high schools back to school to make up their deficiencies.[14]

While this hostile attitude is waning, it still reflects one attitude concerning the status of the two-year college. To be sure, some educators would still take a dissenting view of the two-year college, even if it achieves formal recognition in higher education.

Devall[15] sees the junior college diluting post-high school education and trying too hard to please everybody. He states that most educational problems could be better handled by other organizations rather than "this bugaboo in American education."[16] Indeed, he labels the two-year college as an "organization of the past" and suggests the following present alternatives to replace it:

---

[13] Clyde E. Blocker, *et al.*, *The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 62.

[14] Clyde E. Blocker and H. A. Campbell, Jr., *Administrative Practices in University Extension Centers and Branch Colleges* (Austin, Texas: University of Texas, 1963), p. 11.

[15] W. B. Devall, "Community Colleges: A Dissenting View," *Educational Record*, 49:168, Spring, 1968.

> Proprietary schools--To offer specific vocational education; this is just as good, more efficient, flexible, and reduces the tax burden because they are not publicly supported.
>
> Training on the job--The most efficient and quickest training method; corporations fill their own needs, taxpayers are relieved.
>
> Universal National Service--Between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four, men and women would spend two years in the service of their country. The armed forces already have the most extensive educational facilities in this society.
>
> A nation-campus--Take education to the people by expanding the continuing education function of the universities; this does not have to be on a "campus" per se.
>
> Extension programs--Extend the facilities of state universities; offer better liberal arts programs and provide easier transfer procedures.[17]

This proposal does not represent the popular view among current educators. According to Masiko,[18] Devall demonstrates a startling lack of knowledge concerning the two-year college. He labels Devall's alternatives as unrealistic and cites that they violate free choice.[19]

---

[16] Ibid., pp. 168-170.

[17] Ibid., p. 172.

[18] Peter Masiko, Jr., "A Rebuttal to W. B. Devall's 'Community Colleges: A Dissenting View,'" Educational Record, 49:174, Spring, 1968.

Strength in Diversity. Diversity in American education has long been recognized as one of its strong points. In fact, it is often called the major strength of higher education.[20] Innovation was certainly utilized in replacing or changing such institutions as the Latin grammar school, land-grant colleges, agricultural colleges, academies, and private institutions. That this same innovative diversity is the bulwark of the two-year college movement cannot be denied. And while diversity permits the two-year college to gain strength as a part of American education, it also helps to conceal the true identity of this institution due to an overlap of functions with both secondary and higher education.

Concerning diversity, Gardner writes:

> Such diversity is the only possible answer to the fact of individual differences in ability and in aspirations--it is the only means of achieving quality within a framework of quantity.[21]

---

[19] Ibid.

[20] Norman Burns, "Changing Concepts of Higher Education," The North Central Association Quarterly, 38:296-297, Spring, 1964.

[21] John Gardner, "Quality in Higher Education," Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington: National Education Association, 1958), p. 11.

It is further contended that each institution in American education offers its own unique quality of institutional excellence. This quality of uniqueness helps to describe or differentiate various types of institutions. Relating institutional excellence to the status of junior colleges, Gardner says:

> The traditionalist might say, "Of course! Let Princeton create a junior college and one would have an institution of unquestionable excellence!" That may be correct, but it leads us down precisely the wrong path. If Princeton Junior College were excellent, in the sense that Princeton University is excellent, it might not be excellent in the most important way that a community college can be excellent. It would simply be a truncated version of Princeton University. A comparable meaningless result would be achieved if General Motors tried to add to its line of low priced cars by marketing the front half of a Cadillac.[22]

Thus, the institutional identity of the two-year college rests mostly on its own qualities rather than those of other institutions. However, this identity is very difficult to isolate.

Further difficulty is encountered when one tries to impose an absolute identity upon the changing status of community-junior colleges. The identity of the two-year college is still in the process of being established.[23] Consequently, the best interpretation of identity for the two-year college is that which views its status relative to other institutions of secondary and higher education.

---

[22] Ibid.

[23] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "Concerns and Cautions for Community College," Junior College Journal, 38:18-21, March, 1968.

Relative to Secondary Education

We accept the notion that a college education should become the goal of every American younster, according to Ohles,[24] who sees the high school as the equivalent of yesterday's elementary education. Ohles suggests that "extended education should be continued in the 13th or 14th year of secondary education."[25] Many educators, indeed, subscribe to the philosophy that the two-year college is a very definite part of the secondary school system. This is due, in part, to the fact that many two-year colleges developed as adjuncts to local high schools which resulted in their offering little more than an extended high school curriculum.[26]

Many of the original ties still remain, according to Cohen, who says that the two-year colleges generally "evolved as upward extensions of high schools."[27] He sees these "roots" still evidenced in jurisdiction by local boards, legislated tax-supported bases, coordination by State Departments of Education and credential granting agencies.[28] He does agree, however, that the movement away from secondary education is increasing and that a "unique pattern will evolve combining features of both lower and higher education."[29]

---

[24] John F. Ohles, "Extended Schooling Versus Higher Education," School and Society, 92:156-157, April, 1964.

[25] Ibid.

[26] James D. Logsdon, "A Case for the Junior College," Bulletin of The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 52:62-65, December, 1968.

[27] Arthur M. Cohen, "Developing Specialists in Learning," Junior College Journal, 37:21, September, 1966.

Morrisett[30] states that some observers see the junior college as a clear extension of secondary education and, consequently, they refuse to accept the two-year college as an integral part of higher education.

The two-year college and the high schools are often viewed as screening devices for four-year colleges. Other functions often overlap in those areas where common facilities are shared by both institutions. These facilities often include a cafeteria, gymnasium, auditorium, and athletic field. Indeed, Price[31] strongly recommends that the two-year college should be separate from the supervision and control of higher education. Such a distinction tends to identify the two-year college with secondary education.

---

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Lloyd N. Morrisett, "Educational Assessment and the Junior College," Junior College Journal, 37:12-14, March, 1967.

[31] Hugh G. Price, "Public Schools Through Grade 14," National Education Association Journal, 48:10, December, 1959.

In the words of a junior college dean, the two-year colleges are often thought of as "institutions of inferior instruction."[32] Dean W. Blair Stewart of Oberlin College relates this criticism to the entire educational process, including the liberal arts colleges, by writing:

> Most of the four-year liberal arts colleges in the United States are merely glorified secondary schools. Attitudes and procedures that are appropriate to the secondary school pervade the entire educational process.[33]

Unfavorable criticisms often relate the two-year college with secondary education. Dotson[34] charges that the gains made by the two-year college are often without regard for and at the expense of teachers and students in the elementary and secondary grades. Others see the two-year college and the high school in competition for state and local taxes.[35] While such competition is not favorable for the two-year college, it does describe an interrelationship with secondary education. Medsker[36] sees this interrelationship as a subbaccalaureate function of the two-year college and suggests that it supplements the secondary school while offering little competition.

---

[32] John E. Anderson, Jr., "Research in the Junior College: Anethema or Anodyne?" Junior College Journal, 35:16, November, 1964.

[33] W. Blair Stewart, "Liberal Arts Colleges as Glorified High Schools," School and Society, 87:325, June, 1959.

[34] George E. Dotson, "Advantages to the Junior College of 'Common Administration' School Districts," Journal of Secondary Education, 38:148-150, March, 1963.

[35] Leland L. Medsker, "The Junior-College Picture," National Education Association Journal, 47:628-630, December, 1958.

Other relationships with secondary education see the junior college as a good place to make up high school deficiencies.[37] It is also seen as an institution that fulfills certain aspects of adult education that were formerly a secondary education function. Vail describes this characteristic as "a downward extension of various aspects within elementary and secondary schools accompanying an upward extension or post-school for adults."[38] Whether this function is exercised within a junior college or high school with grades thirteen and fourteen is seen to be of little consequence.

Price suggests that the public schools handle this necessary education inclusively "through grade fourteen."[39] Thus, this post-high school function is closely related to secondary education.

---

[36] Ibid.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Curtis C. D. Vail, "Adult Education," University of Washington College of Education Record, 11:50, February, 1945.

[39] Hugh G. Price, "Public Schools Through Grade 14," National Education Association Journal, 48:10, December, 1959.

Some critics doubt the institutional integrity of the two-year college and refer to it as follows:

> . . . [They say it is a] glorified high school or nothing but a trade school . . . others contend that its credits are not transferable . . . there have been those who doubted the place of an institution like the junior college . . .[40]

To evaluate the effect of the two-year college as an institution related to secondary education, the national assessment program affords an opportunity.[41] Such assessment could certainly reveal academic distinctions that would enable us to evaluate the work of the junior college and secondary school in the light of each other's functions.

Relative to Higher Education

From its inception at Joliet (Illinois), the two-year college has served a function parallel to that of four-year colleges according to Young.[42] Noting that it takes about fifty years for an idea to be incorporated into our educational system, Deyo[43] concludes that the junior college is now firmly

---

[40] Medsker, *op. cit.*, p. 630.

[41] Morrisett, *loc. cit.*

[42] Raymond J. Young, "Critical Times for North Central Area Junior College Development," *The North Central Association Quarterly*, 36:323-327, Spring, 1962.

[43] Donald E. Deyo, "Three Cliches," *Junior College Journal*, 34:6, September, 1963.

established as a key segment of higher education. The junior college is not "junior" to any other institution and it is generally accepted as an institution in its own right with independent roles and functions based on a structural, philosophical concept which, while making it a part of higher education, also distinguishes it from all other institutions.[44]

Some educators see the two-year college as the appropriate vehicle to provide new opportunities in higher education. Doyle identifies the junior college as that segment of higher education best equipped to cope with "the higher education revolution and the exploding demands of the next decade."[45] According to Laine, the underlying premise of the community college movement in the United States today is the "need for new and vital higher educational opportunities."[46]

An obstacle for the two-year college to overcome was the provincial concept that the junior college was "organizationally an upward extension of secondary education."[47] Young[48] cites the provisions established for its administration and legal control as being detrimental to its growth. Consequently, the two-year college is forced to break its ties with secondary education in order to affirm its position within higher education.

---

[44] Ibid.

[45] Newsletter, Maryland Association of Junior Colleges, December, 1968.

[46] Oliver Laine, "Interim Facilities: Blessing or Boomerang?" Junior College Journal, 39:25, November, 1968.

[47] Young, loc. cit.

[48] Ibid.

In seeking a more firm identity, the two-year college is trying to remove itself from "local" control as vested in local public school systems.[49] The dual-functioning board of education--board of trustees is rapidly becoming an outmoded form of control and the two-year college is making strides to break this tie, thus enhancing the chances of a higher education status. The Maryland Association of Junior Colleges suggests the following:

> To function effectively in the academic community, the community colleges must be more closely allied with higher education than with elementary-secondary education.[50]

To effect this position, the American Association of University Professors and some Maryland Chapters report:

> The consensus . . . that the present practice of having one county board responsible for all public schools and all public junior and community colleges was now, or would eventually prove, not in the best interest of higher education.[51]

---

[49] Friedman, op. cit., p. 418.

[50] Paul M. Johnson, "Statements of Position," (Baltimore: Maryland Association of Junior Colleges, October 11, 1968), p. 3.

[51] "Conference Activities," Academe (Washington, D.C.: Newsletter of the American Association of University Professors); March, 1968.

According to Fretwell, community colleges are closely related to comprehensive high schools in terms of their desire to serve a broad spectrum of educational needs and interests but, nevertheless, "they are full-fledged members of higher education."[52] Cox[53] reports that the two-year colleges "are meeting their responsibilities as an integral part of the system of higher education," and some have already initiated honor courses to capitalize on the high achiever.

Public Service and Support. Doyle[54] lists three functions for higher education: teaching, research, and public service. While the traditional function of higher education includes teaching and the advancement of knowledge, a secondary function includes programs of public service which have direct community involvement. It is in this area that the two-year college clearly serves a function of higher education.

Not all writers on higher education accept the adult education function as a part of higher education. Some see it as serving a remedial function and suggest that it be handled by other community agencies.[55] Current trends, however, delegate this function to the community college as a higher education service.

---

[52] E. K. Fretwell, Jr., "Issues Facing Community Colleges Today," Today's Education, 47:46, October, 1968.

[53] Miriam Cox, "The College is for Everyone Cult," Junior College Journal, 47:39, September, 1966.

[54] Walter Doyle, "Community-College Concept in Higher Education," Catholic Educational Review, 64:251, April, 1966.

Technical institutes are sometimes viewed as specialized schools often independent of other schools, but sometimes a part of high schools, community colleges, or extension divisions of universities and colleges.[56] In 1947, the President's Commission on Higher Education suggested that such institutes are public service schools and, furthermore, they are to be considered a part of the community college system within higher education.[57]

Representatives of ten community colleges met to discuss problems they face in interpreting the purposes of the two-year college and agreed on two critical issues. One was the need for better understanding of public services and occupational education.[58] The other was the necessity of convincing the public--voters, donors, legislators, alumni, potential faculty, and administrators--that the two-year college is indeed a full partner in higher education, deserving equal support.[59]

---

[55] Ibid., p. 262.

[56] "Equalizing Opportunity Through Adult Education," A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy, 2:64, December, 1947.

[57] Ibid.

[58] William A. Harper, "Public Relations Problems Discussed by Practitioners," Junior College Journal, 38:42, October, 1967.

The innovation and diversity in public service programs must actually be "sold" to the public and to officials in higher education. "Not educating the public" is seen as a detrimental factor in establishing a clearer identity for the two-year college.[60] The junior college is now formulating its own position in the general plan of higher education and it seeks its own source of funds and support.

On Becoming a Four-Year Institution. Maintaining too close a relationship with other institutions is a danger cited by Jacobsen[61] for the two-year college. The junior college has unique objectives that cannot be realized if it is treated as a stepchild of the secondary school or an affixed appendage to the four-year college.

Gleazer,[62] in discussing the two-year college's relationships with other kinds of higher education, presents the junior college as a distinct part of higher education. Furthermore, he commends the two-year college for not modeling itself after other higher education institutions.[63]

---

[59] *Ibid.*

[60] Joseph M. Jacobsen, "The Junior College Idea in South America," *Junior College Journal*, 39:13, November, 1968.

[61] *Ibid.*

[62] See Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., *This Is The Community College* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968).

The two-year college is often forced to seek identity in the image of its senior counterparts. Due to the provisions established for its administration and control, the junior college is viewed as an institution that is forced to prove itself to its senior partners without duplicating or becoming a four-year institution. This point is stressed by James Harlow,[64] Dean of the College of Education, University of Oklahoma, who says that the two-year college should not even try to pattern itself after four-year colleges because it would lose its unique distinctiveness among higher education institutions. The Strayer Study of 1948 affirms the unique status in higher education for California junior colleges, but also states that they should not become four-year institutions.[65] While this uniqueness is difficult to define, most writers assign this inherent quality to the two-year college alone.

Some-state operated two-year colleges often become four-year colleges merely to accommodate inadequacies within the state educational structure. Indeed, many two-year colleges are pressured into becoming four-year colleges due to unforeseen forces.[66] However, these incidents are few and usually reflect a lack of planning not relevant to the growth and development of the two-year college.

---

[63] Ibid.

[64] "News Backgrounds," Junior College Journal, 36:50 February, 1966.

[65] Emil O. Toews, "California Leads with Many 'Firsts' in Junior College Education," California Education, 1:20, January, 1964.

As reported in one journal, "Some community colleges may offer a full four years of college work, but most . . . will probably stop [in] the fourteenth grade . . ."[67] Very few public two-year colleges actually make the transformation into four-year colleges by design. An incomplete study (1940--1960) reveals that only eight percent of the junior colleges did so and these were private institutions.[68] Similar studies show that when they do change, they lose their comprehensiveness.[69]

Changing a two-year college into a four-year college is not necessarily progress and, indeed, may constitute a disservice. The 1957 report of the President's Committee on

---

[66] Norman Burns, "Association Notes and Editorial Comments," The North Central Association Quarterly, 36:309-313, Spring, 1962.

[67] "Education Adjusted to Needs," Higher Education for American Democracy, 1:67, December, 1947.

[68] D. G. Morrison, "So You Plan to Change Your Junior College to a Four-Year Institution?" Phi Delta Kappan, 47:442, April, 1966.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 443.

Education Beyond the High School reads in part: "Community colleges are not designed, however, to relieve enrollment pressure on senior institutions. They have a role and an integrity of their own."[70] As such, the current status of this development identifies the two-year college as an institution striving to develop its own niche within the stratum of higher education.

The Two-Year College Teachers. The junior college teachers are very much concerned with improving the identity of their institutions. They often work in an atmosphere where the high school image is perpetuated by salary schedules, automatic specified increments, the number of hours at the job, and curricular leadership by administrators.[71] Moreover, according to one sociologist, a deliberate attempt was made to make the two-year college appear different from local high schools so that it would not be viewed as "just another high school," or a "high school with ash trays."[72]

The junior college teachers view "local" control of their institutions by high school boards to be detrimental to a higher education image. They favor a form of the "district" plan of operation which allows a geographic district to solely operate a junior college with its own board of control. This is the national trend.[73] Teachers favor the "higher education-like" image of "district" junior colleges.

---

[70] As quoted in Morrison, "So You Plan to Change Your Junior College to a Four-Year Institution?" Phi Delta Kappan, 47:443, April, 1966.

[71] Arthur M. Cohen, "Developing Specialists in Learning," Junior College Journal, 37:21, September, 1966.

[72] Friedman, op. cit., p. 418.

"Local" junior college teachers generally consider it uncollegiate to share the same facilities, staff, attend school teachers' meetings, sign in and out, take attendance, and perform other similar high school duties.[74] Thus, teachers favor the junior college that seeks a "district" status simply because it provides a means of getting away from a secondary status.

This quest for status and identity takes many forms according to Friedman[75] who lists name changes, the use of academic rank, a separate academic calendar year, "lecture-concert series" rather than "assemblies," and even staying open during a snowstorm when public schools close. Junior college faculties also strive for a higher education identity by seeking greater faculty authority in curriculum, policy making, faculty councils and senates, academic councils, recruitment, advancement, promotion and tenure policies. Unfortunately, no single organization exists as an effective spokesman for faculty members. Consequently prestige is often sought by organizing a local chapter of the higher education organization--The American Association of University Professors. California's junior college instructors initiated the first Junior College Faculty Association in that State in an attempt to affirm their higher education status.

---

[73] Ibid.

[74] Ibid.

[75] Ibid., p. 419.

Junior college teachers are determined to seek a higher education status for the entire two-year college movement. Accordingly, a current issue in junior college education is the acquisition of faculty responsibility. The President of William Rainey Harper Junior College says that more responsibility is being sought by faculties in order to promote and identify "the unique function of the community college as a higher education institution."[76]

Seeing the junior college as having some characteristics of the four-year college and some from the high school, Priest[77] insists that these are in addition to its own unique features of higher education. Furthermore, he concludes that faculty unrest is related to this "yoke of secondary education status."[78] As one teacher related after seeking a position at a two-year college:

---

[76] Robert E. Lahti, "A Faculty Role in Policy Formulation," Junior College Journal, 37:11, September, 1966.

[77] Bill J. Priest, "Faculty-Administration Relationships," Junior College Journal, 34:6, March, 1964.

> . . . [I] discovered that some junior colleges share the same building and/or the same principal with the high school. There is simply no collegiate teaching involved in this sort of situation.[79]

Assigning rank is seen to be more necessary when the junior college becomes a closer partner with the senior institutions. Harrington[80] favors assigning rank to faculty members in order to differentiate them from their secondary counterparts. As community colleges break away from secondary education, their faculties continue to seek the status given to their counterparts in four-year institutions.

Not all junior college teachers are aligned in their attempt to secure a meaningful higher education status. Those teachers not thoroughly aware of the junior college philosophy tend to be influenced by their former high school or college experiences. The newcomer to junior college teaching is often blamed for making the institution a "glorified high school" or a "little university."[81] That junior college teaching is not easily fulfilled by high school or college teachers alone is noted as one quality that typifies the unique status of the two-year college in higher education.

---

[78] Ibid.

[79] "Letters," Junior College Journal, 38:40, May, 1968.

[80] John C. Harrington, "Academic Rank in the Community College," Junior College Journal, 35:25, March, 1965.

State-College Relationships

The two-year college status is often affected by its state and college relationships. For the most part, junior college patterns of control are based upon local pride, support, and orientation.[82] To be sure, local control is viewed as a necessary factor in the development of the two-year college.

While early development of the junior college has resulted from local efforts, many such colleges have developed as state-operated institutions. After studying several alternatives, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Virginia, Georgia, and Minnesota established systems of community-junior colleges, all under state control. It is now apparent that growth and development of the two-year college has been extremely limited in states where state operation was the legal basis for operation. However, rapid development occurred in states that employed local controls as a basis for operation (California, Florida, New York, Michigan, Illinois). "Local" colleges were more faithful to the philosophical criteria used to identify the community-junior college. Local versus state control always tends to favor the "local" college on aspects of faculty qualifications, physical facilities, extent of institutional integrity, and similar indices of quality.[83] Moreover, while "local" support is necessary, it is also related to most aspects of secondary education and, consequently, this casts a degree of secondary status upon the two-year college. While this status is not rigid or formal, it does carry enough force such that it constitutes a major impediment for the two-year college in its attempt to acquire a more firm position within higher education.

---

[81] Bill J. Priest, "On the Threshhold of Greatness," Junior College Journal, 37:7, September, 1966.

[82] James L. Wattenbarger, "Changing Patterns of Control," Junior College Journal, 38:9, May, 1968.

Among other two-year college variations are those junior colleges which are organized as university branches. These branches are most popular in such states as Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Kentucky. Significantly, such institutions are more firmly identified with the parent organizations rather than the high schools. This collegiate influence suggests that such two-year colleges are best identified as institutions of higher education. No matter what manner is employed to view the two-year college, it could hardly be denied that it represents a modern decentralization of higher education.[84]

---

[83] Ibid.

Master Plans. It is now apparent that to become a full-fledged partner in higher education, the two-year college must fit comfortably in a state master plan. In discussing the two-year college's relationships with other kinds of higher education, Gleazer[85] suggests that the two-year college is indeed a distinct part of higher education in a state plan.

A master plan reveals the state's attitude in describing the relative status of its two-year colleges. The extent to which the plan defines the purpose and function of these colleges reveals its character to be representative of secondary education, higher education, or a combination of both. California, for example, identifies its two-year colleges as institutions of higher education while at the same time emphasizing their legal status as secondary education.

---

[84] D. G. Morrison and S. V. Martorana, Criteria for the Establishment of 2-Year Colleges, Office of Education, Bulletin 1961, No. 2 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961), pp. 14-15.

[85] For a detailed discussion, see Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., This Is The Community College (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968).

The Maryland Master Plan. The Master Plan of the Maryland Council for Higher Education pieces together recommendations to guide the State's colleges as they deal with each other, the government, and college students.[86] While Maryland lacks a "system" of higher education, its tripartite "structure" is representative of a common trend among the states. The tripartite structure consists of the University of Maryland, the public four-year colleges, and the two-year community colleges.

Each segment of the higher education structure is seen fighting for State funds with little regard for, or even a knowledge of, the needs and goals of other segments. In the words of the Maryland Council:

> . . . the noncoordinated, unplanned development of educational opportunities and facilities results in a wasteful duplication of academic programs and underused campuses.[87]

One of the objectives of the Maryland Plan is to assist in setting up post-secondary, but pre-baccalaureate, programs necessary to prepare and retrain individuals for the many semiprofessional, technical, and skilled jobs that are now necessary. The Plan lists "the preparation of technically oriented persons [as] the unique function of the community colleges in Maryland . . ."[88] The two-year colleges are asked to prepare people to effectively cope with their "new" needs with or without degrees. The two-year colleges are also delegated the full responsibility of providing remedial programs which are intended to make up deficiencies in the background of college applicants.

---

[86] Moses S. Koch, Digest, Master Plan for Higher Education in Maryland: Phase I (Baltimore: Essex Community College, February 20, 1969), pp. I-36, citing Dr. Joseph N. Hankin, President of Harford Junior College [Md.] for use of his Master Plan Digest. (Mimeographed.)

[87] Editorial in The Evening Sun, Baltimore, January 12, 1969.

Due to overlapping functions, the community colleges are asked to guard against duplicating unnecessarily the adult education activities of the local school boards and other groups interested in serving adult recreational leisure time needs. On the other hand, the Plan states that such activity is permissible for the two-year college in those areas where such programs are not in existence since the colleges already have both the necessary facilities and faculty.

Recommendations relating to governance suggest that the community college have a local governing board distinct from the school board of the county or region they serve. The Plan also affirms the position that the community college must plan for its own separate campus even though temporary facilities are often used first. This requirement will separate the two-year college from high school facilities and, accordingly, support a higher education status.

---

[88] See Koch, Digest, Master Plan for Higher Education in Maryland: Phase I.

In summarizing then, the two-year college is seen as an institution of higher education when viewed in the light of State planning. Also, the two-year college and its teachers are clearly aligned in a quest for identity and status differentiation which is representative of higher education. The whole period of institutional development since 1940 tends to identify the two-year college as a higher education institution.

To be sure, "More research [is] needed," is the concluding recommendation of many journal articles, research reports, conferences, proceedings, and books that examine the purposes and programs of the two-year college.[89] Nevertheless, the present status of the two-year college differentiates it as an institution of higher education.

---

[89] "Needed Research in the Junior College," Junior College Research Review, Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, Vol. 2, No. 6, American Association of Junior Colleges (University of California at Los Angeles, April, 1968), p. 1.

CHAPTER VI

STANDARDS

The rapid growth and proliferation of the two-year college is often allowed to exist with little regard to following some common principles or standards. We tend to be inconsistent in allowing this institution to "be a part of public higher education, yet remain a part of secondary education."[1]

It is not too uncommon to find various forms of discrimination against junior college transfer students when it is time to award scholarships at the senior institutions. Schultz[2] sees this practice as growing from unsubstantial evidence that standards in junior colleges are inferior to those of four-year institutions.

It is felt that the faculties and administration of two-year and four-year colleges do not work with a sincere sense of harmony, but rather one of mild competition. This lack of a common sense of purpose is often due to general misunderstandings of each other's role in a master plan, whether formal or implied. Failure in understanding the junior college is often due to its broad spectrum of educational aspirations and lack of establishing consistent standards.

---

[1] B. H. Peterson, "The Role of the Junior College in California," California Education, 1:3, October, 1963.

[2] Raymond E. Schultz, "Scholarships for Junior College Transfer Students," School and Society, 89:86-87, February, 1961.

State Department-Legislative Standards

There exists a general lack of standardization that contributes to the continuation of high school versus junior college debates. In denying that a State Department of Education viewed the two-year college as an "extension of the secondary school," one Department official affirmed that State standards are set for the junior college in a manner similar to that employed for four-year institutions, not high schools.[3] Apparently, this is one form of signifying that junior colleges operating under state standards are not to be thought of as secondary extensions.

The criteria for establishing a two-year college varies greatly. In 1959, there were twenty-three states that required state agency approval prior to establishing such institutions.[4] An analysis of the manner in which the two-year college is approved often reflects an image of secondary or higher education status. About half of those states that required state agency approval also designated the agencies to be State Boards of Education (California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Mexico, Oregon, and Utah).[5]

---

[3] "Letters," Junior College Journal, 38:38-39, May, 1968.

[4] D. G. Morrison and S. V. Martorana, Criteria for the Establishment of 2-Year Colleges, Office of Education, Bulletin 1961, No. 2 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961), pp. 14-15.

Legislation at the state level is perhaps one of the most effective means by which the two-year college effects changes in its relative status. The trend today is such that the junior college is being placed under appropriate junior college boards rather than State Superintendents of Instruction or even the State Departments of Education themselves.

In Illinois, for example, the Public Junior College Act of 1965 removed the junior college from the supervision of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and gave it to the State Junior College Board which has representation on the State Board of Education.[6] Such an arrangement does not necessarily indicate a complete severance with former ties, but does lessen State Department approval to a position of administrative formality. The Illinois arrangement still provides, however, that the funding agency for occupational education shall remain under the aegis of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

---

[5] Ibid.

[6] Clifford G. Erickson, "Illinois Balances Statewide Planning and Local Autonomy," Junior College Journal, 38:24, March, 1968.

Martorana[7] reports that more than eighteen states have re-examined their approaches for state-level control of the community-junior college and have concluded that separate boards of control are best suited for this purpose. The significance of such a trend implies a desire for a specific degree of separation and identity from the secondary school as seen at the state level.

In 1962, the legislature in Alaska resolved the question of the place of its community colleges by assigning their operational control to the University of Alaska. Such a movement is construed to identify the two-year college as a partner in higher education. Connecticut, however, in 1963, authorized local boards of education to establish post-secondary schools of a community college nature, and subjected them to the State Board of Education for accreditation.[8]

Kentucky decided, in 1962, to subordinate or develop its two-year colleges, as did Alaska and Hawaii; namely, under the supervision and control of the State University rather than under the State Department of Education. However, in this case, the intent to remove junior colleges from the secondary school influence was challenged. Consequently, the courts have ruled that a public school district may legally contract with a state university to co-establish and co-maintain a public junior college.[9] Therefore, secondary ties are still maintained on a legal basis.

---

[7] S. V. Martorana, "Developments in State-Level Governance," Junior College Journal, 39:25, January, 1969.

[8] S. V. Martorana and Robert F. McHugh, "State Legislation: 1962-64," Junior College Journal, 36:28, March, 1966.

A 1964 law in Michigan created a State board for public community colleges with the function of advising the State Board of Education. Minnesota also established a State system of junior colleges under a special State board in 1963.[10] Such boards were to be clearly representative of higher education rather than secondary education.

New Mexico, in this same period, legislated that its junior colleges would not be a part of the system of free public schools and would not be under the control of the State Board of Education. On the other hand, it did allow for the establishment of two-year university branches under the joint agreements of local school districts and the senior institutions.

North Carolina authorized the State Board of Education to establish a special department to administer the State system of community colleges and at the same time authorized the conversion of three such colleges into four-year institutions.[11] This latter example typifies inadequate state-level planning and has proven to be detrimental to junior college growth.

---

[9] Montague v. Board of Education of Ashland Independent School District, 402 S.W. (2d), 94 (Ky.).

[10] Martorana and McHugh, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

Confusion was brought about in Virginia where one legislative act removed the word "junior" from two such colleges which were, however, to remain two-year branches of the College of William and Mary. Another law incorporated a division of the University of Virginia as a two-year "branch," which in 1964 became an integral part of the University, changing its status from "branch" to "college." Finally, two other laws changed the status of two divisions of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute to that of "two-year branches" of the Institute.[12] Such action at the state level is generally misleading and not necessarily representative of the national movement which strives to establish a definite image within higher education.

By 1969, there existed a clear consensus that the states were favoring separate boards of control for their two-year colleges. According to Martorana,[13] this plan is acceptable to all involved and no major part of this responsibility will be relegated to any other board or part of a state's system.

---

[11] Ibid., p. 30.

[12] Ibid.

[13] S. V. Martorana, "Developments in State-Level Governance," Junior College Journal, 39:27, January, 1969.

A closer view is now presented of significant developments in the states of California, New York, New Jersey, Florida, and Maryland. These states are selected due to their general leadership in the two-year college movement and also on behalf of their relevance to the development of this paper.

California. The California School Code originally established its two-year colleges as an integral part of the secondary school system and admitted graduates of any high school and "such other candidates over eighteen years of age as may be recommended for admission by the principal of the junior college."[14] Statutes in 1963 provided, for the first time, some financial assistance for junior college construction and capital expenses. According to Toews:

> The past is characterized by a legal and functional association with secondary education; the future indicates a legal and functional association with higher education . . .
>
> The identification of junior colleges legally as well as functionally with higher education is a trend of concern . . . the community junior college [should] serve the educational needs of the majority of students who

---

[14] John W. Harbeson, Classifying Junior College Students (Pasadena, California: Pasadena City Schools, February, 1932), pp. 3-4.

> will not, cannot, or should not undertake a post-high school program of four or more years.[15]

Many requests from junior college educators went unheeded to the Superintendent of Public Instruction requesting a junior college division within the Department of Education. Consequently, the legislature recently created the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges who have since relieved the State Board of Education with respect to financing and controlling the two-year colleges.[16] This legislation represents a desire on the part of legislators and educators alike as they seek to identify these two-year colleges more closely with the four-year institutions.

Concerning the need for a chief spokesman in the California system for junior colleges, the California Junior College Association stated:

> Since the chief executive officer will serve as a state spokesman for the junior colleges in their relationships with other state agencies, his position should be comparable to the chancellorship of the state colleges, the presidency of the university, and the directorship of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.[17]

---

[15] Emil O. Toews, "Janus Looks at the Junior College," California Education, 1:8, June, 1964.

[16] John Lombardi, "California's New State Board," Junior College Journal, 38:27, March, 1968.

[17] Ibid., p. 28.

It is worth noting other changes in the California struggle that indicate a parallelism with higher education. For example, "community" was used for the title of the Board of Governors because "junior" implied unequal status connotations. The term "board of governors" was clearly differentiated from the "board of trustees" and "board of regents" to prevent other confusion.[18]

Some junior colleges, however, still wished to remain under the State Board of Education because it was so involved with the problems of elementary and secondary education that little time was left for the junior colleges. This minimum control by the State was seen as desirable and inevitably leading to a separate board for junior colleges anyway.

As of March, 1968, there were eighty-two junior colleges in the State, eight using "city college", and sixty-three using "college"; none making use of the term "community."[19] Nevertheless, there is still concern "on the issue of secondary versus higher education status for the junior colleges."[20] The California Junior College Association offered a legal opinion stating that "the junior colleges are included with high schools in the classification of secondary schools under the governing provisions of the constitution and statutory law."[21] The dual status as described here is considered by some to be highly desirable in California since it assures the eligibility of two-year colleges for an equitable share of federal funds. Thus, the Board of Education is still the responsible State agency in such matters, acting upon the advice and recommendations of the junior college board.

---

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid., p. 29.

[20] Ibid.

Present legislation in California prohibits high schools from establishing new junior colleges. It does, however, permit new junior colleges to be governed by boards independent of high school or unified districts. This was a necessary step in developing a higher education status for junior colleges. A second such step for status was embodied in the Donahue Higher Education Act which defines the State's position for higher education. It reads in part:

> Public higher education consists of (1) all public junior colleges heretofore and hereafter established pursuant to law; (2) all state colleges . . . and (3) each campus, branch and function of the University of California . . . (Education Code, Section 22500).[22]

Another section deliberately states, in part:

> The public junior colleges are secondary schools and shall continue to be a part of the public school system of this State . . . (Education Code, Section 22650).[23]

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] Henry T. Tyler, "Full Partners in California's Higher Education," Junior College Journal, 35:4-5, March, 1965.

[23] Ibid.

This legally defined dual status is confusing but still necessary for the procurement of federal funds. Indeed, the State colleges themselves hold this double legal status.

The Donahue Act also standardizes the functions of the junior colleges as follows:

> Public junior colleges shall offer instruction through but not beyond the 14th grade level, which instruction may include, but shall not be limited to, programs in one or more of the following categories: (1) standard collegiate courses for transfer to higher institutions; (2) vocational and technical fields leading to employment; and (3) general or liberal arts courses. Studies in these fields may lead to the associate in arts or associate in science degree (Education Code, Section 22651).[24]

While such functions are considered normal for the two-year college, the overlapping status of secondary and higher education is declining.

It is of interest to note that, legally, all offerings of the public junior colleges are to be considered higher education and therefore "collegiate." Tyler lists three myths described by Tillery in a paper prepared for a seminar. They are:

> Myth 1--Only those courses which are recognized by universities for transfer purposes are college-level.
>
> Myth 2--There is some sort of absolute standard for college courses which is determined by the nature of the subject taught, and which can be readily determined and applied regardless of the students being taught.

---

[24] *Ibid.*

> Myth 3--Education for immediate employment is somehow less collegiate than education for work which requires transfer to another institution.[25]

Tillery also expresses a current view on ideas essential to understanding standards and college level courses. It reads in part:

> "Standards": The only meaningful definition of "standards" in education is determined by the quality of teaching and the resources for learning. Badly taught courses have low standards whether they are at the freshman or graduate levels. Excellently taught courses have high standards whether they are concerned with remedial English or quantum physics . . .
>
> "College-level": Those courses which concern themselves with the educational needs of young and mature adults as they prepare for advanced study, skilled work, or as they seek greater freedom and refinement of mind, are of college-level. In California such courses are to be determined by the characteristics of students who are to be educated in the various segments of a differentiated system of higher education . . .[26]

Consequently, the entire offerings of junior colleges are viewed as "collegiate" or higher education.

In summation then, it may be stated that California has separated the junior colleges from the secondary schools at the State level of governance. At the same time, however, the secondary status of the junior college is reaffirmed for certain financial reasons. The junior college is now represented at the State level and these representatives hold an official status similar to officers in the State colleges and university system. And finally, all offerings of the junior college are to be considered a part of higher education.

---

[25] Ibid., p. 7.

[26] Ibid.

Thus, California leads the way by which states standardize and effectively differentiate their junior colleges from secondary schools; namely, by state-level legislation. In general, however, the secondary status of the junior college will be retained until such time that federal legislation is updated to cope with these colleges in a more realistic fashion. And even here, it is evidenced mainly in those areas dealing only with teaching credentials, budgets, multi-financing units, apportionment, attendance reports, equalization support, and articulation procedures. The typical fifty-year lag between public support of higher education and secondary education, as cited earlier, must necessarily be shortened.

New York. The first public community college and appropriate legislation was enacted in 1948, thus making the efforts of New York typical of the "newer" states in this movement. The Board of Regents, the chief educational authority, published a report in 1964 which affirmed the educational soundness of those community colleges that offered the services of university transfer, occupational, general education, adult education and guidance programs.[27] This report also asserted that community colleges are viewed as distinct and separate from both secondary education and upper division collegiate education. Master plans of the City University, State University, and the Regents all make the community college an integral part of their long-range planning. Procedures for accomplishing such a plan all indicate that the two-year college has already been accepted into the higher educational enterprise.

Among the Regents' 1964 statewide plan is a provision for junior year scholarships designed for eligible junior college students. It is also of interest to note that vocational programs are encouraged under local public school auspices as are the community college programs leading to employment in the technical and semiprofessional areas. The law also allows for two-year colleges to offer courses less than two years in duration while suggesting the abolition of the legal provision authorizing four-year community colleges. This latter provision was anachronistic and generally misleading to the public.

Such recommendations tend to produce workable standards for this phase of education. Senior institutions are urged to build their programs upon the foundations established in community colleges. There is also some need to "preserve the historical articulation and complementary services of high schools and community colleges in the occupational training field."[28] In addition, there is a desire to give more autonomy to local boards of trustees who presently have no taxing power and are fiscally dependent on the sponsoring agency which may include a board of education, county board of supervisors, city council, and so forth.

---

[27] S. V. Martorana, "Progress and Plans in the Empire State," Junior College Journal, 35:12, May, 1965.

The past struggle for recognition and acceptance, according to Martorana,[29] is finished in New York. And so it appears that in this State, under the leadership of a single authority, the Regents, close articulation and a higher education status were quickly afforded to the community college in less than sixteen years.

New Jersey. Prior to 1962, New Jersey had thirteen two-year colleges, twelve of which were private. Consequently, it may be considered among the newest states in the quest to provide this type of education.

The first significant legislation aimed at defining the manner by which community colleges could be established and operated was The County College Act of 1963.[30] The word "county" is employed in New Jersey possibly due to its strong form of county governments. Noteworthy in the procedure for establishing county colleges is that the initiative must be local, whereas the county board of trustees, in whom the overall college governance functions are vested, is subject to the standards and regulations of the Board of Higher Education.[31] Prior to this time, higher education matters fell under the aegis of the State Department of Education as did the secondary schools which may have been a factor in passing The Higher Education Act of 1966, which became effective on July 1, 1967. This Act created the Department of Higher Education in New Jersey, a clear attempt to upgrade the image of all post-secondary education. An appropriate council, composed of the college presidents and the chairman of each board of trustees, functions within the Department of Higher Education in an advisory capacity.

---

[28] Ibid., p. 13.

[29] Ibid.

Clearly then, The Higher Education Act of 1966 separates secondary schools and higher education in New Jersey. However, one problem still remains in the area of occupational education which is administered by the Division of Vocational Education within the State Department of Education. Federal legislation that funds such activity uses the wording "vocational education," and since much of this is being done in the community colleges, it is felt that the State plan should be rewritten enabling the community colleges to receive their fair share without being subjected to the controls of the Division of Vocational Education in the same manner which it serves the secondary vocational schools of the State.[32]

---

[30] Angelo C. Gillie, "New Jersey Community Colleges: A Report and Prognosis," Junior College Journal, 38:35, November, 1967.

[31] *Ibid.*

Gillie[33] also suggests that the technical institutes and other post-high school occupational programs should come under the control of the Department of Higher Education rather than the present State Department of Education. Such a move would indeed be consistent with the State's Master Plan and general philosophy of higher education. Such a move would also reaffirm the concept that the present two-year college is more closely aligned with higher education rather than secondary education. The latter association still persists due to inadequacies in legislation as they apply to the federal funding of vocational-occupational training at the post-secondary level.

---

[32] Ibid., p. 37.

[33] Ibid.

Florida. Several phases of development were experienced by Florida's two-year colleges. The first began when the Omnibus School Bill of 1947 was presented as the vehicle that enabled a combination of State and local funds to be used in supporting all phases of education from kindergarten through the junior colleges.[34] A Community College Council was initiated by the Board of Control, more recently called the Board of Regents, and presented a comprehensive plan to the legislature in 1957. This plan envisioned such growth for the two-year colleges that 99 percent of the State's population would eventually be within commuting distance. Nevertheless, approval for such colleges was to be based on a local survey and was to be authorized by the State Board of Education.

The final phase of Florida's developing community colleges is observed from 1957 to the present. The strength of this system is seen as local control with state guidance and leadership in a coordination capacity. Christian and Wattenbarger[35] cite this development to be not only higher education, but a structure suited to be the national standard pattern for the entire two-year college movement.

---

[34] Floyd T. Christian and James L. Wattenbarger, "Ten Years--A Plan Evolves in Florida," Junior College Journal, 38: 45, September, 1967.

[35] Ibid.

One final noteworthy achievement occurred on July 1, 1968, at which time Florida's junior colleges were to be operated by local districts, each having a board independent of the high school board.[36] Previously, these colleges were operated as part of a county school district with an advisory committee to make recommendations only. Thus, again, an example of legislative influence is demonstrated as it moves the two-year college further along the road of separation from secondary school affiliations.

Maryland. Pesci and Hart[37] reported that the long struggle for separate boards began in 1961, soon after the Maryland General Assembly legalized the creation of two-year colleges by local boards of education. Prior to that time the legal basis for operation was that of providing for "a general program of continuing education."[38]

Local boards have long constituted the boards of trustees such that the school superintendents act as secretary-treasurers to the boards. Indeed, one attempt was made to legislate that presidents of community colleges would report to their boards of trustees by way of the superintendents.[39] Opponents to independent boards of control argue that present boards, with dual responsibility for elementary-secondary and community college education, are the best means by which intercooperation is provided. Little merit and much criticism are given to this statement of position.

---

[36] "News Backgrounds," Junior College Journal, 38:48, May, 1968.

[37] Frank B. Pesci and Royal Hart, "The Question of Governance in Maryland," Junior College Journal, 38:7, February, 1968.

[38] Ibid.

And so, Senate Bill 2 was passed in 1968 which provided for the creation of a separate State Board for the control of community colleges.[40] It also provided that local boards of education would exercise the option of maintaining control of community colleges in their jurisdictions. Significantly, the word "promotion" was substituted for "control" in relation to the new State Board's jurisdiction.

Senate Bill 393 would have established the provisions whereby local boards could ask the Governor to appoint a separate local board of community college trustees.[41] This bill remained in the House Ways and Means Committee. Also of interest was proposed Senate Bill 216 which would have created a State Board of Higher Education and provided for its membership, power, and duties.[42] It would have created the office of Commissioner of Higher Education and provided for the transfer of these functions from the State Boards of Education to this new Board. This bill remained in the Senate Finance Committee.

---

[39] Ibid., p. 8.

[40] General Assembly of Maryland, 1968, Senate Bill No. 2.

[41] General Assembly of Maryland, 1968, Senate Bill No. 393.

Thus, the significant legislation that passed the General Assembly created a separate board for community colleges on the State level which serves as an advisory board to the State Board of Education until June 30, 1969, after which time it will have full responsibility for the community colleges in Maryland. Shortly after this bill was signed into law by Governor Agnew on May 7, 1968, the three largest community colleges, under the leadership of their local boards, announced the passage of resolutions requesting the Governor to appoint separate Boards of Control by July 1, 1969.[43]

Maryland would do well to pass a variation of such former legislative proposals that would remove the community colleges from the jurisdiction of the State Department of Education and that would also remove local jurisdictions from the boards of education acting as trustees. Hence, a State

---

[42] General Assembly of Maryland, 1968, Senate Bill No. 216.

[43] "News Backgrounds," Junior College Journal, 39:84, December, 1968-January, 1969.

Board of Higher Education and separate boards of trustees are seen as delaying the emerging community colleges in Maryland from accepting a more realistic position in the stratum of higher education.

Accreditation Practices

Accreditation in American higher education was originally conceived as a means of quality control. A review of the literature reveals that such accreditation is a proper function of State Boards of Education and State Departments of Education. Sometimes this power is shared with other state agencies such as universities and appropriate commissions either on a legal, voluntary, or quasi-official basis.

Accreditation, when performed by state universities, is often beneficial to securing better qualified instructors, laboratories, and libraries. Such was the case in 1915 when the University of Missouri began statewide accrediting for purposes of standardizing its junior colleges.[44] The process of accreditation is often described in the light of such terms as accredit, admit, approve, certify, classify, file, license, recognize, and register, among others.

Regional Accreditation. In the past, the two-year college did not feel the need for regional accreditation, nor did it appreciate some of the advantages, especially since most of these colleges had state recognition in various forms.[45] State recognition on accreditation was a formalized attempt to certify minimum standards in such aspects as programs, curriculum, faculty, libraries, physical plant, administration, experimentation, and so forth. As such, it was minimal and not difficult to obtain. Indeed, many schools, including the two-year colleges, were prone to seek this accreditation and use it as an official barrier behind which they could keep their programs immune from a more critical evaluation.

---

[44] Jesse H. Coursault, "Standardizing the Junior College," Educational Review, 49:59-62, January, 1915.

William K. Selden,[46] Executive Director of the National Commission on Accreditation, reveals that while each state possesses the authority to control higher education, few exercise this legal privilege to any meaningful extent. Indeed, many two-year colleges found security in hiding behind their state parent. Since state department accreditation was not too meaningful, it was strongly suggested that a system of voluntary accreditation by a regional agency would be preferred to evaluation by a governmental agency.[47]

---

[45] William K. Selden and William G. Land, "The Forgotten Colleges," The North Central Association Quarterly, 35:271-273, April, 1961.

[46] William K. Selden, "Struggles and Tensions in Accreditation of Higher Education," Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington: National Education Association, 1965), pp. 119-122.

Accreditation has generally developed as a non-governmental check on educational standards. Furthermore, a recent survey revealed that accreditation is mostly sought by the junior college as an attainment of status.[48] Regional accreditation as an agent of conformity was viewed positively, especially when this conformity meant a guarantee of minimal standards and recognition as full-fledged colleges.[49] The major claim for regional accreditation, that of improving the quality of educational institutions, is only partially supported. It is also contended that staff members are not concerned with accreditation implying standards; they fail to see it as a force for conformity. Evaluation reports as issued by the accrediting agencies were seen to be of little use other than for public relations purposes. Consequently, such claims indicate that the accreditation process is in need of further revision if it is to function more realistically.

Regional associations were originally dominated by the liberal arts colleges who held to a puritan view by not accrediting teachers colleges, specialized institutions, and junior colleges.[50] Thus, regional accreditation procedures often viewed the two-year college as an inferior institution. This often caused junior colleges to seek accreditation from state agencies or universities in spite of the fact that this type of accreditation was not always meaningful. Another acceptable alternative was to avoid seeking accreditation at all under these circumstances.

---

[47] John J. Collins, "Accreditation Aims and Perceptions," Junior College Journal, 38:21, December 1967-January, 1968.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

The American Council of Education proposed a consistent set of standards for the two-year college to "facilitate an interchange of students and credits between the junior colleges and other higher educational institutions."[51] The Council recommended that in accrediting junior colleges, certain principles must constitute minimum standards. For example, the student was to have satisfactorily completed four years of high school, or its equivalent, in a field correlated with the curriculum to which the student was admitted. The junior college was to require at least sixty semester hours of college level work. Each institution, however, was to adopt qualitative standards suited to its own individual conditions.

---

[50] William K. Selden, "Struggles and Tensions in Accreditation of Higher Education," Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington: National Education Association, 1965), pp. 119-122.

[51] Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College, Research Publication, Education Series No. 5, Vol. II (Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1924), p. 640.

Other recommendations included that junior college teachers should have a baccalaureate degree and one year of graduate work. A teaching schedule of more than sixteen hours per week per instructor or class size in excess of thirty was to be interpreted as endangering educational efficiency. Furthermore, at least fifty students were to be registered in the institution. The two-year college was also expected to operate on a minimum budget of $20,000 annually. In addition, it was required that appropriate materials, equipment, and upkeep be provided. Finally, the Council suggested that the two-year college should be inspected and reported upon by agents of accrediting organizations.[52]

These principles are still employed to some degree. While qualitative aspects are still reasonable, the quantitative aspects of class size, institutional size, and operating budget have grown to greater proportions.

Accreditation standards still vary among the states and also the regional accrediting associations. Peik[53] says that better salaries, professional status, and increased security result from rigid accreditation standards. Accordingly, Priest[54] describes rigid accreditation to be highly desirable for the two-year college. Such a tightening of standards would do away with such practices as having a business school change its name to that of a junior college. Gombar[55] cites such practices to be inconsistent with accreditation principles. He affirms that accreditation implies "substance" behind the institution.[56]

---

[52] Ibid., appendix.

[53] W. E. Peik, "What Better Accreditation Means," National Education Association Journal, 39:186-187, March, 1950.

In August, 1964, the Board of Directors of the American Association of Junior Colleges passed the following appropriate resolution as a guideline:

> Regional accrediting associations should bear the primary responsibility for accreditation of community-junior colleges. These regional associations should examine and reformulate, where necessary, their procedures and policies so that they can evaluate total programs of community-junior colleges.[57]

Burns[58] sees accreditation "as a whole" to be better

---

[54] Bill J. Priest, "On the Threshold of Greatness," Junior College Journal, 37:7, September, 1966.

[55] William Gombar, "From Business School to a Modern Junior College," Education, 88:241-244, February-March, 1968.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Thomas B. Merson, "The Crisis in Accreditation," Junior College Journal, 35:7, February, 1965.

[58] Norman Burns, "Some Basic Problems of Accrediting," The North Central Association Quarterly, 35:193-197, October, 1960.

than the segmental or partial accreditation as provided by the professional agencies. Accreditation of the two-year college has had long associations with both regional and professional groups. Indeed, many conflicts have risen because of this two-track possibility and Koos, as early as 1924, questioned who should be permitted to accredit the "new upper secondary school unit."[59]

Many aspects of regional accreditation still reflect upon the relative status of the two-year college. For example, during World War II, junior college students did not receive draft deferments because their colleges never received regional accreditation. General Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service, issued a recent statement regarding draft classification of junior college students which reads:

> Local boards may continue to consider for Class II-A those registrants who are pursuing a full-time course of study that will not lead to a baccalaureate degree. Boards are authorized to allow such students to complete their programs. Students transferring from one institution to another, whether a two-year or four-year institution, may be considered for II-S or II-A status depending upon the educational programs in which they enroll, provided that they continue to make normal progress, in accordance with regulations, toward completion of their programs.[60]

Thus, the two-year college student is now given comparable recognition in selective service procedures as is his four-year counterpart.

---

[59] Koos, loc. cit.

[60] "News Backgrounds," Junior College Journal, 38:50, April, 1968.

Another current situation is that which would allow a qualified junior college transfer student to transfer after one year of junior college study, providing that the student has twenty-four hours of transferable credit. This plan utilizes the regional associations and their standardized criteria for junior colleges and would permit a third year of eligibility for qualified athletes rather than the present two-year allotment.

The statements of policy and position presented here show a clear attempt of the two-year college to establish a line of demarcation between it and secondary education. Regional accreditation and its implications are now a serious concern for the two-year college whereas it has always been a continued concern for the high school. Current practices and procedures demonstrate that the two-year college is seeking regional accreditation as a means of attaining a higher education status. High school accreditation procedures are not undergoing rapid change and testing as suggested here. It is apparently still sufficient to deal with minimum standards, self-evaluations, improvement, research, and experimentation. While the secondary school continues to test itself by seeing how far it goes beyond attaining minimum standards, the two-year college does so to establish its identity within higher education.

Professional Accreditation. It took the professions themselves to overcome inconsistencies and weaknesses within state department and regional accreditation practices. The professions initiated professional accreditation as the second major pattern for the two-year college to accept. Such accreditation was applicable to the specialized programs which were becoming an integral part of the junior college offerings. According to Selden,[61] most institutions seldom imposed accreditation upon themselves for specialized programs anyway. Consequently, a struggle for control emerged between the professional and regional accrediting agencies.

According to Gleazer,[62] professional accreditation of junior college programs is a necessity in the technical and semiprofessional areas. The accreditation issue is of critical importance, especially to the new junior colleges or those offering new programs for the first time. Status and identity are directly related to the success or failure that is experienced in these colleges.

In order to achieve accreditation in one dental assistant program, five special courses and one general education course were required of the junior college student who must be at least a high school graduate with six months of experience as a dental assistant.[63] The rigor of this type of professional accreditation is further demonstrated by the Council on Dental Education of the American Dental Association which also requires the student to pass a proficiency examination in general dental assisting administered by the college's dental assistant department--prior to enrolling.[64] Certainly, such a criteria reflects the high standards that can be imposed by professional agencies so that the overall college program is improved.

---

[61] Selden, loc. cit.

[62] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "AAJC Approach," Junior College Journal, 37:5, September, 1966.

Professional accreditation was actually brought about for the two-year college since past performances of the regional associations were unsatisfactory. The Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education adopted a policy affirming that regional associations will not approve specific programs.[65] Since higher education tends not to turn to governmental intervention, it was only natural that more confidence was placed in the professional accrediting associations. After all, it is their profession that is really being safeguarded or viewed in the public eye.

---

[63] "News Backgrounds," Junior College Journal, 38:54, October, 1967.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Merson, loc. cit.

Professional accreditation is profusely involved in junior college programs. It includes such areas as architecture, business, chemistry, dentistry, engineering, forestry, journalism, library science, medicine, music, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, podiatry, psychology, public health, social work, teacher education, and veterinary medicine.

For a time, accrediting associations only operated upon high schools and four-year colleges in some states.[66] They are often condemned for their inconsistent and inadequate failure to get involved in the accreditation of junior colleges.[67] Even today, several regional associations take an approach to evaluation that employs specialists to view the institution in the light of its special programs, thinking in terms of interrelating the parts to the whole institution.[68] Indeed, some regional agencies would still compete with the professional agencies for the accreditation of junior colleges. In general, however, most professional organizations will not attempt accreditation unless the institution has first been "cleared" by a regional accrediting agency.

---

[66] Collins, _op_. _cit_., p. 19.

[67] _Ibid_., p. 21.

[68] Burns, _loc_. _cit_.

Federal Standards

Federal standards are reflected in certain methods of funding the two-year college and also in legislation. These procedures are established such that the two-year college is viewed as an integral part of higher education.

The National Commission on Accreditation recently stated its position wherein one of the functions of accreditation is to "safeguard the interests of the public, not only in terms of [spending] . . . but also in terms of protecting the welfare of society against poorly prepared personnel in the health-related professions . . ."[69]

The Commission, in noting some reluctance of many institutions to become involved appreciably in specialized accreditation, developed a proposal whereby the regional accrediting associations would consent to engage in a system using personnel from the specialized field and employing appropriate guidelines and criteria of recognized professional accrediting associations in the institutional accrediting process. This optional procedure for determining eligibility for federal funding has now been accepted by most appropriate agencies, including the American Association of Junior Colleges, the U. S. Office of Education, the

---

[69] "N.C.A. Announces Optional Eligibility Procedure," Junior College Journal, 38:59, September, 1967.

Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissioners of Higher Education, the National League for Nursing, and others.

To implement this policy, the National Commission publishes an appropriate list of recognized accrediting agencies for the associate degree programs. Associations on this list will:

> 1. Grant formal program accreditation at the associate degree level when institutions request such accreditation and when programs meet approved standards.
>
> 2. Work cooperatively with the various regional accrediting associations in establishing eligibility for federal funds for associate degree programs in institutions which elect to secure eligibility through means of the institutional review offered by the regional accrediting associations.
>
> 3. When so requested by an institution, directly certify eligibility for federal funding of an associate degree-level program with the appropriate federal agencies.[70]

Such standards reflect governmental interest in federal funding of junior college programs and, furthermore, it is done in such a manner to suggest that the two-year programs are to be considered a part of higher education rather than secondary education.

Most of the recently passed federal higher education and vocational education bills were clearly earmarked to include the two-year colleges. Among such acts are included the Education Professions Development Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act, the Vocational Education Act, and the Allied Health Professions Act.

---

[70] Ibid.

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, for example, singled out community or technical colleges to receive 22 percent of construction funds for all undergraduate academic facilities.[71] The Vocational Education Act of 1963 authorized increased appropriations for construction and program support in "area vocational educational schools" which, according to the Act, include certain junior college divisions offering vocational education.[72] In a rather weak manner, such schools were also inclusive of those admitting as "regular students both persons who have completed high school and those who have left high school."[73]

The Economic Opportunities Act of 1964 authorized the establishment of the college work-study program designed primarily to stimulate part-time employment for students from low income families who should be in higher education institutions. Such legislation considers the two-year college as a part of higher education.

---

[71] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "Junior College Explosion," American Education, 5:12-13, December, 1968-January, 1969.

[72] "Two Legislative Landmarks in One Month," Junior College Journal, 34:4-5, February, 1964.

[73] Ibid.

The Education Professions Development Act (Public Law 90-35) established programs at four-year institutions as well as junior colleges. These programs support training in all junior college fields, including the advanced training of teachers, administrators, and other professionals.[74] Also included are programs in post-secondary vocational education, adult education, community services, and education of the disadvantaged.

While such legislation is helpful in funding various programs, it does little to clarify the interrelationships of those institutions involved in the actual process. Specifically, such legislation often fails to specify the role of the two-year college. Mallan[75] recommends legislative revision such that the two-year colleges are specified rather than implied in its wording. Referring to the Vocational Education Act and Nurse Training Act, he writes:

> . . . [the junior college movement is] trying to insert its interests and concerns into legislation which is already proposed to support other branches of the field of higher education.[76]

It is suggested here that while such federal legislation is indeed necessary, it must be spelled out more specifically in the light of its recipients and their classifications within the whole educational process. As presently worded, much of this legislation is open-ended and subject to various interpretations by those indirectly involved in the educational process. A clearer statement of legislative intent is often feared by some who see it becoming more restrictive; it need not. It may remove some of the stigma attached to post-secondary education as carried on in two-year colleges. It may even emphatically designate such institutions as members of higher education--a position attested to right now.

---

[74] "News Backgrounds," Junior College Journal, 38:54, May, 1968.

[75] John P. Mallan, "Commission Commitments," Junior College Journal, 36:52, May, 1966.

[76] Ibid.

Legislation as reviewed in this chapter is a major factor that literally hastens a fuller acceptance of the two-year college into higher education. A partnership of state legislators with the cooperation of the U. S. Office of Education is rapidly effecting a positive change in the status of the two-year college. Legal recognition in higher education is a necessary factor in securing permanency and acceptance of community-junior colleges for the future.

CHAPTER VII

CURRICULAR IMPLICATIONS

Certain aspects of curriculums will be dealt with here to the extent that they help to delineate or differentiate the two-year college from secondary school education. That it is easy to do this is somewhat inconsistent with the professional literature. Logsdon,[1] for example, points out that many junior colleges were developed as mere adjuncts to the local high schools which resulted in their offering an extended high school curriculum.

Koos[2] suggested that there has long been a downward shift of college subjects and courses. Trigonometry was a standard college course in 1825, while philosophy, ethics, economics, and logic dropped from being offered in the upper divisions to the lower divisions.[3] Such a downward shift went past the freshman level well into the high school with such subjects as English grammar, geography, algebra, plane geometry, ancient history, French and German, and English literature.[4] Indeed, it was such early curricular chaos, among other things, that brought about the requirement for students to specialize.

---

[1] James D. Logsdon, "A Case for the Junior College," Bulletin of The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 52:62-65, December, 1968.

[2] Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College Movement (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1925), p. 121.

[3] Ibid.

Specialization in the liberal arts colleges is basically an upper division task, thus allowing a natural line of demarcation for general education in the two years of lower division work. Such general education is but one facet of the two-year colleges' offerings. Fretwell[5] lists four areas as being typical of junior college curriculums. They include career programs for technicians or semiprofessionals, transfer programs also leading to the associate degree, short term courses, workshops, institutes, etc., and guidance services to help a person find his place in one or more programs. Obviously, such programs are not easily broken into specific categories reflecting secondary education or higher education. No standard criteria are now accepted that would enable such a categorical analysis.

During the early movement, an extensive survey in about two hundred cities indicated that the junior college curriculum favored teaching history, English, language, science, physics, chemistry, and the "usual college subjects."[6] Areas receiving low support included composition, engineering, geometry, calculas, law, nursing, library science, music, nursing, surveying, analytical geometry, and architecture. These latter courses are certainly an integral part of present two-year college curriculums.

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] E. K. Fretwell, "Issues Facing Community Colleges Today," Today's Education, 57:46, October, 1968.

Many educators felt that merely offering the first two years of general education was too limited a task for junior colleges to perform. Commissioner Wood of California wrote:

> Under provisions of the law, the courses of study in the junior college departments must approximate those offered in the first two years at the university. This limitation should be removed so that the junior college department may become a self-directing institution, free to adopt itself to community needs. It is well, perhaps, that the junior college department, in its infancy, was under college tutelage, but the time for limitation of the work of the junior college has passed. There is need in various communities in the state for post graduate courses of a vocational nature, including courses designed to fit students for civic occupations as advocated by Dean Alexis F. Lange of the School of Education at the University of California. In certain communities the junior college may offer courses in higher commercial law, business management, accounting, banking and finance. There is need also for the introduction of Spanish and of Spanish-American history, customs and institutions, with a view to fit young men for commerce and trade in Spanish American countries. For such students the study of literary Spanish is of doubtful worth.
>
> In certain communities the junior college should offer courses in practical engineering--civil, structural, mechanical and electrical. They should give courses in plane surveying, strength of materials, hydraulics,

---

[6] Frederick E. Bolton, "What Should Constitute the Curriculum of the Junior College or Extended High School?" _School and Society_, 8:726-727, December, 1918.

> architecture, and bridge design. In other communities, advanced practical courses in agriculture may be offered. It is essential, therefore, that the law shall be so drafted that courses other than those approximating the first two years at the university may be offered.[7]

Thus, even in the early 1900's there were those who would speak of a broad curriculum for the two-year college. This scope advances the position of the two-year college beyond that of a high school and subsequently that of a community service organization. But whether this mode would be acceptable as higher education still remained to be seen during this early period.

Dean Lange of the University of California reported that the two-year college was developed as an "upward extension of the existing high schools" and further suggested that they must do more than "merely be preliminary to the last two years of college . . ."[8] He wrote of this early period:

> It is of course an inevitable phase of development that as yet not one of the junior colleges has fully found itself. But even now the uncertainty that exists relates rather to matters of organization and method than to fundamental conception and aim. It is coming to be generally understood that the junior college can not serve its complete purpose if it makes preparation for the university its primary object. For the great majority of junior college students, courses of instruction and training are to be of a piece with what has preceded; they are to be culminal rather than basal. The junior college will function adequately only if its first concern is with those who will go no farther, if it meets

---

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 728-729.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 729.

> local needs efficiently, if it turns many away from the university into vocations for which training has not hitherto been afforded by our school system. Hence it will of necessity be as nearly autonomous as its place in the public school system of the state permits; (a) departments designed to promote general social efficiency, (b) departments designed to furnish complete training for specific or vocational efficiency.[9]

Hence there were those who saw the preparation of transfer students to be incidental rather than the chief curricular function within junior colleges. Current trends appear to affirm this position, but not by downgrading the transfer program. There appears to be sufficient time and resources to provide diversity in curriculum offerings. Here, as with other aspects of the two-year college movement, not all agree. In 1964, the Educational Policies Commission of The National Education Association recommended that two years of college should be available free of cost to all high school graduates and, furthermore, these two years should be directed at intellectual growth, not vocational or technical training.[10]

Many sources may be tapped by the junior colleges to provide curricular leadership but, unlike the secondary schools, this project is usually faculty rather than administrative oriented. Universities and professional organizations also get closely involved in such revision but, again, this is usually in close harmony with teaching faculties. The Commission on College Physics has recently established a panel to consider improving instruction in physics by assisting the instructor in the development of physics courses which are designed for vocational and technical curriculums.[11] This venture for two-year colleges was established in concert with a professional organization and the University of Maryland.

---

[9] Ibid.

[10] "News in Education," Chicago Schools Journal, 45:234, February, 1964.

One obvious problem that is encountered in evaluating junior college curriculums for similarities and differences is the difficulty to distinguish between services for adults and education for adults. Charters[12] sees the educational, quasi-educational, and noneducational often being lumped into one administrative unit. This tends to bring the criticism of lowering standards in the junior colleges. Indeed, adult education was once thought to be remedial where now it is better seen as a continued process throughout the life span. Consequently, Charters defines an adult student as follows:

> . . . [one] who has a major occupation such as homemaking or the practice of law and studies part-time concurrently with his or her vocation or studies

---

[11] "News Backgrounds," Junior College Journal, 38:50, May, 1968.

[12] Alexander N. Charters, "Pressures on Higher Education for Adult Education Services," Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington: National Education Association, 1965), pp. 134-137.

> full time for a short period of less than a semester without interrupting the career pattern."[13]

Much study is needed in this area to present a more accurate picture of adult education in the light of constituting a continuing or remedial function. Perhaps even these terms are synonomous under specified conditions. It is suggested here that the national assessment program has great potential in revealing the characteristics of secondary and junior college education.

Vocationalism

Vocationalism has made substantial gains into the liberal arts curriculum, especially in the junior colleges. The effects of this phase of education on the two-year college have brought about many changes. The American public does not fully understand what it really is and educators themselves debate the issue. By design, legislation, and budget techniques, vocational-occupational education has been somewhat separated from the mainstream of American education. Even the U. S. Office of Education chooses to house vocational education in quarters removed several blocks from its centralized location.

The law states that vocational education includes "programs designed to fit individuals for gainful employment as semiskilled or skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations."[14] It is in this area that the two-year college is charged with its unique function. It is also in this area that the curriculum is made to fit a broad category of needs. Skaggs[15] says that, by far, most occupational education of the future will have to be taught on the post-high school level.

---

[13] *Ibid.*

Apparently, vocational education is not sufficient for present needs if just offered in the secondary schools. Indeed, even now it is recognized that separate vocational high schools are more effective when compared with comprehensive high schools.[16]

A major force that brought about such diverse vocational curriculums was the spread of mass education. Between 1870 and 1955 the total population increased fourfold while the high school population increased eighty times. College enrollments went from 72,000 to about 2.5 million. Illiteracy, characterizing twenty percent of the population in 1870, had dropped so low that the standard census question on ability to read and write was replaced in 1940 by one calling for the number of years of schooling. Urbanization and industrialization helped to increase societal demands in this area as did the fear of obsolescence.

---

[14] Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Selected Education Acts of 1963, United States Senate Committee, 88th Congress, First Session (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963), p. 95.

[15] Kenneth G. Skaggs, "Report from St. Louis," Junior College Journal, 37:43, September, 1966.

[16] Jacob J. Kaufman, et al., "Role of Secondary Schools in Preparing Youth for Jobs," Bulletin of The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 52:112-113, February, 1968.

Supported largely by local tax funds, the junior college is especially responsive to local needs. Stern[17] sees this closeness to be somewhat dangerous for the two-year college since it would be essentially in the same administrative and pedagogical hands as the local high school. He sees the junior college offering a curriculum "in which all but the most indifferent and/or indolent may learn a terminal profession."[18]

Stern[19] has contempt for the two-year college since he sees its curriculum aiding the recent decline in liberal arts colleges. He writes that there is no place for the traditional four-year college in a system that extends mass public education upwards another two grades beyond high school. It is suggested that the junior college curriculum be aimed at servicing the advanced trades by producing technicians for business, industry, and health related professions. While such a position is not dominant at this time, it is representative of a vociferous minority that continues to question the validity of curricular offerings in junior colleges when judged in the light of higher education.

---

[17] George Stern, "Higher Education in the Mass Society," Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington: National Education Association, 1964), pp. 112-115.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.

California is one state that has legally defined all junior college courses as "collegiate" and due the recognition of higher education offerings. This is apparently true whether such offerings are to provide a higher skill and technical ability, aid high school dropouts, help the disadvantaged, or aid displaced workers in need of retraining. California places heavy emphasis on a curriculum of general education during the first twelve years of school, leaving the teaching of salable skills to the community junior colleges or technical institutes.[20]

Junior college occupational education is perhaps different from secondary vocational curriculums insofar as the former places heavy emphasis on skills, judgment, work and study habits, and attitudes necessary for entering suitable employment.[21] Such tasks as these are best accomplished when the student has acquired a degree of maturity usually not found in the average high school student. Age alone is often sufficient to make this difference.

---

[20] George E. Arnstein, "Vocational Education," Bulletin of The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 48:68, November, 1964.

[21] Ibid.

Burt[22] cites that areas of distinction between vocational curriculums in secondary schools and junior colleges are somewhat overlapping and vague. Many educators believe that the industrial arts curriculum can also prepare students for entry-level jobs as semiskilled workers since most high schools offer programs ranging from the beginning level to intermediate and advanced levels at grade twelve. Such vocational education is usually offered in grades ten through twelve as well as adult evening programs in secondary schools. Technical education is usually offered as a post-secondary school program "often cited as grades 13 and 14" in technical high schools, area vocational schools, technical institutes, community and junior colleges. Burt also points out that other schools, such as technical high schools and comprehensive high schools, may provide comparable vocational education programs at grades ten through twelve as well as technical education at the post-high school level. Consequently, areas of distinction are indeed vague.

Emerson[23] predicts that occupational education will become an integral part of the entire educational picture rather than a separate branch. He sees it becoming fully accepted on a par with other college programs due to the involvement and influence of community colleges. He still sees a need for additional vocational-technical schools on both secondary and post-high school levels and suggests the following criteria for making the decision as to whether the curriculum should be offered at the post-high school level:

---

[22] Samuel M. Burt, Industry and Vocational-Technical Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), p. x, preface.

[23] Lynn A. Emerson, "Occupational Education in the Future Community College," Technical Education News (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company), pp. 5-6.

> 1. If the occupational curriculum is generally classified as semiprofessional.
>
> 2. If the geographical area required to recruit sufficient qualified students for a program of optimum size is substantially greater than the area ordinarily encompassed by the high school district.
>
> 3. If the maturity demanded by employers for entrance into the occupation is beyond that of the average high school graduate.
>
> 4. If the prestige of a post-high school institution is needed to attract the type of student required for the program.
>
> 5. If on-the-job learning time required for development of full occupational competency is substantially less for a graduate of a post-high school program than for a high school graduate in the same field.
>
> 6. If the level and type of curriculum requires high school graduation, including the completion of specified courses, as a minimum foundation for undertaking the occupational study.
>
> 7. If the cost of initial installation of equipment, and its upkeep and maintenance, is beyond the fiscal ability of the high school district.
>
> 8. If the state proposes to meet the needs of students from widely scattered communities whose small high schools have little or no provision for occupational education.

> 9. If the state desires to meet the needs of people who want to work after high school graduation with no specific occupational training, and who later want to enter full-time training to prepare for better jobs.
>
> 10. If there is need for a wide range of evening courses in the community which require advanced technical equipment beyond that normally possible in high school occupational training programs.
>
> 11. If a suitable post-secondary educational institution is available--such as a junior college--to which may be added appropriate occupational education curriculums.[24]

Such criteria are indeed used to decide at what level vocational-occupational education is to be offered. It is also apparent that much overlapping is present and perhaps necessary. Similar programs may be placed on the secondary level in one instance and on the two-year college level in another. The integrity and success of such offerings apparently rests on local acceptance. These are among the situations, however, that, when viewed on the national level, do much to weaken the cause of junior colleges as they strive to become integral partners in higher education. Obviously, the curriculum that is offered will have much influence in determining the relative status of junior colleges. And, furthermore, since some are more comprehensive than others in this respect, various degrees of acceptance will be noted by these institutions. To consider them as a collective unit is especially difficult in the light of their curricular implications.

---

[24] *Ibid.*

The area of curriculum is especially suited to research and development in the junior colleges since it is undergoing constant revision. The resulting direction of this revision will ultimately relate the junior colleges more closely to either secondary education or higher education. It is also suggested here that the two-year college, while enjoying rapid growth and expansion, has yet to make its full impact on American education. The present state may be viewed as an interim condition since such colleges are still in the midst of their development. Consequently, a look at some "new" curriculums will be presented here for consideration and review.

While high schools offer a variety of vocational education courses, they apparently lack the wide range presently in demand for the semiprofessions. Most junior colleges have a director of some sort whose chief responsibility is developing and implementing new programs. This process often includes a survey of local employers and agencies in order to contemplate needs. If such a preliminary step indicates the need for further inquiry, the next step may include general involvement among the secondary schools, the public, industry, and the junior colleges. Eventually, the process is such that other institutions are polled to avoid needless duplication. It is here that some duplication of service may overlap with the secondary schools. Final curricular approval is usually sought from the State Board of Education or the appropriate State Board for Community-Junior Colleges. Sometimes it is also wise to seek accreditation from an appropriate specialized agency as is often found in such fields as banking, business, and nursing.

Toews[25] reports that California junior colleges are offering three types of nursing curriculums which include a one-year practical or vocational nursing program. The other two provide training for a two-year degree program in addition to training comparable to the first two years of a four-year baccalaureate curriculum. The one-year practical nursing program is also offered nationally at area vocational-technical schools which demonstrates one possible overlap.[26]

Indeed, California even passed Senate Bill 508 which enabled the two-year associate degree nursing program to produce registered nurses.[27] This curriculum formerly required three years of training in nursing schools but is becoming quite popular as a two-year offering in the junior colleges. While such a program is terminal in nature, most courses are of the transfer type.[28] In 1968, The National League for Nursing began a program which would help establish new nursing curriculums in the junior colleges, senior colleges, and universities.[29]

---

[25] Emil O. Toews, "Nursing Education--A Community Service," California Education, 1:19, March, 1964.

[26] A news item in The Morning Call, Allentown [Pa.], February 27, 1969.

[27] Virginia Z. Barham, "Curriculum in the Associate Degree Nursing Program--Some Unanswered Questions," California Education, 3:18-19, February, 1966.

Other diverse curriculums include preparation for entry into such areas as law enforcement, social service, health, recreation, urban development and public welfare technology. Also to be found are curriculums in teacher education, drama, journalism, public relations, advertising, sculpture, data-processing, marketing, retailing, and salesmanship.[30]

Typical of other curricular innovations are those offered to upgrade jobs and improve community culture. These often include courses in reading, spelling, sewing, clothing construction, auto tune-up, or basic electricity.[31] One community college listed seventy-seven night courses, many non-credit, among which were included remedial work in reading skills and speed reading.[32] Also to be found are the standard four-year college offerings which include lower division courses in art, biology, business administration, chemistry, economics, English composition, engineering, geography, physical education, history, library science, mathematics, music, philosophy, physics, political science, psychology, science, sociology, and speech, among others.

---

[28] Ibid.

[29] "News Backgrounds," Junior College Journal, 38:52, May, 1968.

[30] "Community College Model for Review," The Sun, Baltimore, December 8, 1968.

[31] A news item in The Evening Sun, Baltimore, January 27, 1969.

Specialized areas include data processing, electronics, fire service, police administration, quality control, forestry, and so forth. Many curriculums are listed as specialized technologies and include audio-visual, architectural, ocean engineering, design and drafting, electrical, and mental health areas.

One community college listed programs including art exhibits, film presentations, plays, lecture series, vocal and instrumental concerts.[33] Indeed, Chicago's "TV College", a unit of Chicago City Junior College, offers its televised lectures to the public and grants Associate in Arts degrees recognized by accrediting agencies throughout the country.[34] Diversity in curriculum is so great that at least one junior college is embarking on a Master's degree program in cooperation with area universities.[35] Doctoral programs have been similarly established.

---

[32] A news item in The Evening Sun, Baltimore, January 20, 1969.

[33] A news item in The Sun, Baltimore, January 26, 1969.

[34] B. Lamar Johnson, "The Two-Year College," The Journal of Higher Education, 37:409-410, October, 1966.

No attempt has been made here to investigate junior college curriculums thoroughly. Proliferation of new curriculums in junior colleges is surpassing institutional growth. Many of these "new" areas will prove to be temporal and those that remain will stand the test of time.

One conclusion reached here is that of noting the uniqueness of junior college curriculums in higher education. While many educational areas overlap with the secondary schools and four-year colleges, curricular innovation is a major thrust of the junior college movement at the present time. The impact and influence of curricular revision remain to be fully realized. Thus, the area of curriculum constitutes a prime subject in need of further research.

---

[35] Samuel Tilghman, "Harford County Bureau Notes," _The Sun_, Baltimore, September 19, 1968.

CHAPTER VIII

ARTICULATION--DOWNWARD AND UPWARD

The two-year college finds itself positioned somewhere between the secondary schools and four-year colleges. The fine line that sometimes separates these institutions could be analyzed in terms of how each works with the others. This manner of interaction or articulation is informal and encompasses all aspects of the educational process. In particular, the two-year college finds itself concerned with the transfer student and curricular offerings that provide continuity without duplication. While articulation procedures were historically influenced by tradition, they are now reflected more intelligently in state master plans for higher education.

Downward Articulation

Many curriculums appear to overlap in the junior colleges and high schools, especially in the area of vocational-occupational education. Such was the topic of the previous chapter. Brick[1] concludes that most chairmen of high school departments agree that the two-year college tends to duplicate the high school curriculum. An appropriate survey revealed that high schools want better articulation in addition to advanced placement for their students who transfer.[2] The survey revealed great misunderstanding by both institutions as to the work each was doing, and no effort was made to attempt to coordinate programs between the secondary schools and two-year colleges. Furthermore, there were many cases of wasteful duplication of services which were due to poor counseling. This inadequate articulation suggests the need for more planned, coordinated curricular activities for secondary and post-secondary education.

---

[1] Michael Brick, "Two Plus Two," Junior College Journal, 38:27, October, 1967.

Seay[3] reports that some high schools are taking over the function of the junior college and the college is reciprocating by teaching in fundamental areas more appropriate for the high schools. Some overlap in function is due to the inability of secondary schools to perform their functions adequately. Corey[4] sees this to be a prime factor causing current problems between the secondary schools and two-year colleges. It is shown that junior college students are most troubled with English, spelling, punctuation, and study habits.[5] Such primary functions are well within the scope of secondary education and only recently were they directly aimed at the two-year college in the form of remedial education services.

---

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] C. W. Seay, "High School-College Articulation," *Bulletin of The National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 48: 58, September, 1964.

[4] Arthur F. Corey, "Universal Educational Opportunity Beyond the High School," *Current Issues in Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964), pp. 182-185.

While junior college educators exert vigorous efforts to help improve education at lower levels, many of them feel that correcting the faults of college students who cannot read and write well is not a proper function of higher education.[6] This feeling is in direct contrast with the current trend of assigning the remedial function in higher education to the junior colleges.

According to Fox,[7] relations with higher education were seldom harmonious for the secondary schools. A barrier to effective articulation is raised by the fact that the secondary school teachers frequently feel that college personnel "know nothing and care less about what goes on in a public school."[8] In an effort to produce greater harmony, intervisitation techniques are being employed. Such techniques allow administrators and teachers to visit each other and exchange ideas so that both institutions are made aware of each other's problems. According to a recent study, success is more positive when the intervisitation is initiated by the college and chaired by the secondary representatives.[9]

---

[5] Brick, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[6] Corey, *loc. cit.*

[7] Raymond B. Fox, "Improving Relations Between High Schools and Colleges," *Education Digest*, 27:49, May, 1962.

[8] Joseph M. Vocolo and Douglas C. Sheppard, "High School-College Intervisitation," *The Modern Language Journal*, 50:477, November, 1966.

Ollerenshaw[10] suggests that some functions are best performed in the high schools and others are best suited for colleges of further education. In other words, what is needed is not the replacement of one by the other, but a perfected manner in which both work together complementing each other's services. According to Scannell,[11] a need exists for improved cooperation between educators in institutions of all types and at all levels due to the significant number of students enrolled in two-year colleges. The whole area of inter-institutional cooperation is difficult to analyze due to inconsistencies and overlapping functions. Moreover, Kintzer[12] lists insufficient communication among high schools and colleges to be the most serious problem for effective articulation.

---

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] Kathleen Ollerenshaw, "Wasteful Overlapping Between Schools and Colleges," *The Times Educational Supplement* [London], No. 2763, Friday, May 3, 1968.

[11] William J. Scannell, "What Do Teachers Think About English in the Two-Year College?" *Junior College Journal*, 37:28, September, 1966.

[12] Frederick C. Kintzer, "The California Plan of Articulation," *College and University*, 43:160, Winter, 1968.

Many qualified high school students are afforded the right to test their school's articulation with higher education by seeking advanced standing in a limited number of disciplines. This is usually accomplished by passing appropriate national or institutional examinations. Actually, only five percent of all entering freshmen receive this advanced credit.[13] While collegiate knowledge is often learned in the secondary schools, it often fails detection due to poor articulation procedures.

According to Parker,[14] the secondary school is being criticized for continually losing various aspects of quality. Such criticism is often made in connection with the two-year college influence. Poor coordination and articulation was noted by Koos as early as 1924 at which time more than one-third of the high school work was duplicated by the junior colleges.[15]

In answering the question, "Do colleges determine what the high schools teach?", Seyfert provides an emphatic, "Yes!"[16] Unfortunately, most curricular revision has been directed toward the college-aimed students and overlooks a majority of students who do not matriculate in four-year institutions of higher education.[17] It is in this area that the junior college acts in an intermediate articulation capacity on behalf of, and in harmony with, the senior institutions.

---

[13] Sterling L. Shaw, "Knowledge Equals Credit or How to Enter College as a Sophomore," College and University, 43:534-535, Summer, 1968. (A panel discussion).

[14] Franklin Parker, "Continuity Between High School and College," Educational Leadership, 18:346, March, 1961. (A class discussion).

[15] Ibid.

Close articulation between institutions of secondary education and higher education is a complex situation that often requires a legal line of demarcation between them. Pearson[18] suggests such a need but states the proper technique to be employed is merely that of identifying locally controlled institutions as "secondary" while identifying those under a broader means of control as "higher" education. Secondary schools and junior colleges are too often controlled by single boards such that this basis has no value when it becomes necessary to define a line of separation between them.

---

[16] Warren C. Seyfert, "Do Colleges Determine What the High Schools Teach?" Education Digest, 26:28, November, 1960.

[17] Sidney Sulkin, "The Challenge Summarized," Bulletin of The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 50:78, Summer, 1966.

[18] Richard Pearson, "National Admissions Testing Programs--Their Value to Colleges--Their Impact on Secondary Schools," College and University, 39:494, Summer, 1964. (A panel discussion).

Morrison[19] states that high school-junior college articulation is a simple procedure, especially when both institutions are responsible to a single board of control. While the statement is true, it is also anachronistic. He sees the junior college as "a sorting machine which has a compartment for every student who can secure benefits from post-high school education."[20] Indeed, his attitude is a typical one that presents the state of high school-junior college articulation in a favorable manner, a point not well taken in the professional literature.

Upward Articulation

Studies on the success of junior college students who transfer to senior colleges are becoming numerous. The results rather consistently show that, as a group, such students perform satisfactorily in senior colleges. A study by Schultz[21] shows that high ability students are not penalized in any way by taking their first two years in a junior college.

---

[19] D. G. Morrison, "Articulation of The High School and The Public Community Junior College in the United States," Bulletin of The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 43:104, September, 1959.

[20] Ibid., p. 106.

[21] Raymond E. Schultz, "A Follow-up on Honor Students," Junior College Journal, 38:10, December, 1967-January, 1968.

Studies by Medsker, Clark,[22] and others have shown that public junior college students come from the various occupational backgrounds in about the same proportion that these groups are represented in the community served by an institution. Obviously, some junior colleges incur various degrees of difficulty in their articulation problems due to the nature of their student composition. In spite of these institutional differences, it is usually noted that quality of instruction and guidance is more highly rated for junior colleges by those students who have successfully transferred to senior colleges.[23]

Knoell and Medsker[24] conducted a research project in which it was learned that eighty percent of the junior college students who applied for transfer status did so without difficulty in meeting the standards and requirements of senior institutions. This study involved more than 7,000 transfers from 345 junior colleges who entered 41 senior colleges and thus may be considered to be representative of the national scene. Fifteen percent of the transfer students did, however, report that loss of credit in the process was a serious problem. Consequently, the articulation problem with senior institutions, while not extremely critical, is still in need of much revision.

---

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

[24] Dorothy M. Knoell and Leland L. Medsker, *Factors Affecting Performance of Transfer Students from Two-to-Four Year Colleges: With Implications for Coordination and Articulation*, Cooperative Research Project No. 1113 (Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, 1964).

Roueche lists four factors that are representative of junior college transfer students and lead to the conclusion that:

> 1. Students who . . . transfer to senior institutions typically experience a lower grade-point average during the first semester following transfer.
>
> 2. In most cases, the transfer student's grades recover from the loss which occurs during the first semester.
>
> 3. Grade-point averages of transfers improve with each successive semester in which they are enrolled at the senior institutions.
>
> 4. The transfer student who does graduate may take longer to reach the baccalaureate than does a comparable native student.[25]

These findings are similar to those of Knoell and Medsker[26] and reinforce prior data as far back as 1928.[27]

---

[25] John E. Roueche, "Gaps and Overlaps in Institutional Research," Junior College Journal, 38:21, November, 1967.

[26] Dorothy M. Knoell and Leland L. Medsker, Factors Affecting Performance of Transfer Students from Two-to-Four Year Colleges (Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1964); and Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges (Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1964).

[27] H. M. Showman, "Junior College Transfers at the University of California at Los Angeles," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, 4:319-322, June, 1929.

Nelson[28] also confirms the findings of Knoell and Medsker and says that the junior colleges are objectively performing their articulation function with the senior colleges. Nelson's method of testing this function is based upon whether or not the senior institutions accept junior college credit. Such a technique is considered shortsighted by those junior college personnel who continually strive to please the senior institution. In many cases this results in decisions arbitrarily being made by a department chairman or an admissions officer or his representative. Senior institutions are placing more confidence in the junior colleges, especially in the area of innovative curriculums and articulation procedures. Indeed, the mere magnitude of the two-year college movement is reversing the process and the articulation leadership is now being provided by the two-year institutions.

Meadows and Ingle[29] report one study that shows seventy percent of all university and college transfers who were unsuccessful in their initial college enrollment succeeded in the junior college. This was due to the nature of the student and the relaxed environment of the junior college. It is also pointed out that faltering transferees are coming back to the junior colleges from senior institutions due to failure experiences. Indeed, one experiment shows that the transfer who is ineligible to return to his prior institution is equal or superior to the native junior college freshman in the light of aptitude and achievement variables.[30] On the other hand, students who have been unsuccessful at the junior college are poor academic risks when they transfer to another junior college. This second or third-chance feature of the two-year college sheds light on a unique aspect of articulation, namely, that of dealing with the downward transfer from senior institutions--reverse articulation.

---

[28] James H. Nelson, "Do Junior College Transfers Make the Grade?" The National Education Journal, 54:55-57, October, 1965.

[29] Mark E. Meadows and Ronald R. Ingle, "Reverse Articulation: A Unique Function of the Junior College," College and University, 44:49, Fall, 1968.

At present, upward articulation is made easier by providing upper level institutions whose chief function is to provide for the two-year college product. Typical of such upper-level institutions are the University of West Florida (1967) and Florida Atlantic University (1964), both of which offer junior-senior level work in addition to graduate study.[31]

---

[30] Ibid., p. 50.

[31] William A. Harper, "West Florida's New Two-Year University," Junior College Journal, 37:13-15, September, 1966.

Other such institutions are located at Dearborn, Michigan, and Staten Island, New York.[32] More study is needed in the area of articulation, especially with reference to anticipating the future growth and influence of junior colleges.

Articulation Proposals and Implications

Mansfield[33] reports that articulation among higher education institutions began in 1932 when President Robert Sproul of the University of California appointed the University of California Junior College Conference Committee. As a planned and continued cooperative effort, the Engineering Liaison Committee was started in November, 1947, due to the efforts of the late Dean L. M. K. Boelter of the University of California at Los Angeles. Concerning this Committee, Mansfield writes:

> . . . the Committee was established primarily for the purpose of making all schools in the State which offer pre-engineering training a part of a unit working together toward the common goal of well-trained individuals to go into the junior year in engineering training. The primary function of the Committee [is for the] exchange of information . . .[34]

---

[32] Louis B. Mayhew, "What's Ahead for Higher Education?" National Education Association Journal, 56:16-18, December, 1967.

[33] Henry Mansfield, Jr., "Engineering Liaison Committee Planning in California," Engineering Education, 59:229, November, 1968.

[34] Ibid.

Early articulation procedures usually consider transfer policies and their effects on junior colleges. The universities fear that watered-down courses will become too common if the junior college is given too much freedom in articulation. Professors fear that academic subjects are likely to be diluted--that transfer students will not be uniformly prepared for the rigorous competition of upper division standards.[35]

Junior college leaders base their arguments heavily on the percentage of students they enroll and the relative success of their junior transfer students. They point out that a rigid conformity to university offerings is curtailing any opportunity for curricular innovation.[36] These conditions tend to create faulty relationships between the various levels of higher education.

Some educators see the present prospect of ambiguity in transfer status as constituting a critical problem for junior college students. Nelson[37] presents this contention by noting that even those transfers who select a suitable senior college are likely to encounter some problems from the imperfect articulation between the two institutions.

---

[35] Frederick C. Kintzer, "Articulation is an Opportunity," Junior College Journal, 37:16, April, 1967.

[36] Ibid., p. 17.

[37] James H. Nelson, "Guidelines for Articulation," Junior College Journal, 36:25, March, 1966.

The right to establish curriculums and standards has long been a faculty responsibility. Ironically, little success is encountered when faculties are directly involved in articulation matters in this area.[38] Consequently, articulation is often found to be an administrative or legislative function under faculty influence.

Courses that appear common to the junior and senior college are readily transferred. Such piecemeal tactics involving individual courses, descriptions, credits, and evaluative criteria constitute an outmoded form of curricular articulation. It took two years of constant harassment to wear down the retiring admissions chairman at Harvard before he would allow for that university to accept transfer students from junior colleges.[39] Yale, on the other hand, took the initiative by sending a student to a junior college and granting full credit for work taken there.[40]

California. California had the best model for articulation in 1964, mainly because of the greater dependence placed on its junior colleges for lower-division instruction.[41] The heart of this model is the Articulation Conference which involves representatives from secondary schools, the junior colleges, the State Department of Education, the State colleges and the University. The prime purpose of the Conference is to confer with one another and improve articulation so that a fuller mutual understanding is achieved.

---

[38] Irvin G. Lewis, "Junior-Senior College Articulation Plans: Florida, Michigan, California," College and University, 43:586, Summer, 1968. (A panel discussion).

[39] Frederick deW. Bolman, "New Opportunities in Articulation," Junior College Journal, 36:20, March, 1966.

[40] Ibid.

Such an arrangement had existed in California since 1944 and was formed as a voluntary organization with no authority to make binding commitments on behalf of the schools or colleges.[42] An administrative committee acted as a clearinghouse for matters referred by member colleges and outside agencies. Membership in this Articulation Conference was open to all levels and disciplines in education.

The articulation problem, while serious, does not affect all transfer students. Indeed, California junior colleges are experiencing a "very drastic decrease" in engineering enrollment simply because the four-year colleges have expanded their facilities sufficiently enough to admit most students in their freshman year.[43] It appears to be uneconomical to offer lower division courses in engineering and impossible to comply with smooth transition from junior to senior colleges.

---

[41] Dorothy M. Knoell, "How Can Two and Four-Year Colleges Provide Articulation in the Face of Rapid Change?" Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington: National Education Association, 1964), p. 218.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Mansfield, loc. cit.

Another problem is beginning to develop and is detected in a statement presented by the University of California at Los Angeles. It reads in part:

> . . . The Faculty of the College of Engineering voted to discontinue operation as an academic college in favor of instituting operation as a professional school to be known as The School of Engineering and Applied Science. In the University of California system, a school accepts admissions at the junior level. Students who enter the proposed school will do so with the expectation that they will proceed without interruption to the Master's degree [and] approvals are being sought [for this program]. It is anticipated that no lower division engineering courses will be required for admission. This does not imply that no credit will be given for lower division engineering courses completed by the student in a Junior College. It is considered likely that Junior College engineering courses which are now accepted by the College *may*, for the most part, be used by the School as satisfying certain of the upper division requirements. Elective credit may be given for Junior College courses which have no counterpart in the School's curriculum.[44]

This undoubtedly will create some new articulation problems for junior colleges in California even though the senior colleges are now required to accept, without question, those junior college courses equivalent to, or nearly equivalent to, courses offered in lower divisions of senior institutions. Automatic credit is also granted for general education courses.

---

[44] Mansfield, *op. cit.*, p. 230. (Emphasis supplied).

New courses from junior colleges must be approved by the University's Director of Admissions. Courses with no parallel in the senior institution are accepted if appropriate toward a University degree. Consequently, the California system is such that junior college officials are invited to the University campus to negotiate articulation agreements.[45] Kintzer[46] reports such a process to be complex and slow, but also effective.

Recent revisions allow the junior colleges to certify that the minimum general education requirements (40 credits) have been satisfied in part or in full. As such, this revision is openly accepted by four-year institutions.

One college president evaluates California articulation as follows:

> 1. The procedures represent a recognition of the fact that the welfare of the individual student is the first concern of both parties. Because of the agreements reached relative to course equivalency, the students know the work undertaken in the Junior Colleges will be acceptable at UCLA.
>
> 2. The counselors and program advisers in the Junior College can advise students relative to courses to be completed in the Junior College for transfer credit with a high degree of confidence. This situation contributes to the professional stature of the Counselor.

---

[45] Irvin G. Lewis, "Junior-Senior College Articulation Plans: Florida, Michigan, California," College and University, 43:579-580, Summer, 1968. (A panel discussion).

[46] Frederick C. Kintzer, "Articulation is an Opportunity," Junior College Journal, 37:17, April, 1967.

> 3. The Faculty at UCLA attains a reasonable degree of confidence that the work taken in the Junior College is equivalent to the instruction offered at UCLA and, in consequence, represents adequate preparation for advanced work at UCLA.[47]

Without these procedures, Kepley concludes that it would be impossible to implement the transfer function of the two-year colleges as assigned to them by the Master Plan for Higher Education.[48]

In summary, the "Articulation Conference" of California is a quadripartite statewide organization that is devoted to the efficient progress of students from the high school through graduate school. It has the chief function of informally supervising the entire articulation process. The plan carries the weight of agreement rather than edict.[49]

Illinois. In Illinois, the Public Junior College Act of 1965 moved the junior college into higher education by removing the junior colleges from the supervision of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.[50] Control was vested in a State Junior College Board and representation also granted on the State Board of Higher Education. Articulation between two and four-year colleges is being undertaken by a Council on Articulation which was created by the Illinois Conference on Higher Education. This Council includes all two and four-year, public and private institutions. Articulation matters are handled by informal cooperation within the Council. The Illinois plan is typical of the current trend in which legislative influence is used to guide articulation procedures.

---

[47] Lewis, op. cit., p. 585.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Frederick C. Kintzer, "The California Plan of Articulation," College and University, 43:154, Winter, 1968.

[50] Clifford G. Erickson, "Statewide Planning and Local Autonomy," Junior College Journal, 38:24, March, 1968.

Michigan. In Michigan, each college, university, and community college is autonomous in its own curricular offerings.[51] There is no statewide mandatory acceptance of credits and, consequently, both the two and four-year institutions are forced to share the articulation responsibility. This type of articulation is too general and does little to strengthen the two-year college position in higher education. Nevertheless, the institutional autonomy of the two-year college is upheld.

Florida. Florida has taken great initiative, as did California, in providing legislation to direct the articulation process. The Plan for Community Junior Colleges, published in 1957, called for a liaison committee on articulation which consisted of representatives from the university system, the junior colleges, and the State Department of Education. This group, called the Professional Committee for Relating Public Secondary and Higher Education, was established in July, 1957.[52]

---

[51] Lewis, op. cit., p. 578.

The sixteen members of this Committee are appointed for three-year terms by the Secretary of the State Board of Education which is composed of the Governor, the Secretary of State, the Attorney-General, the Treasurer, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. This board is responsible for elementary and secondary education through sixty-seven county boards; community-junior colleges through the State Junior College Board, and twenty-five specifically approved county boards of instruction; and the universities through the Board of Regents. The State Board, therefore, is a coordinating agency with the local boards and the Board of Regents serving as operating boards. The State Junior College Board also serves in a coordinating capacity for the junior colleges, each under its own local operating board.[53]

The articulation committee is authorized to do the following:

> Identify problems of articulation and programs or other phases of operations where secondary schools,

---

[52] James R. Strawbridge and James L. Wattenbarger, "Articulation--Florida Style," Junior College Journal, 37:50 March, 1967.

[53] Ibid.

> junior colleges, and state universities relate or which need evaluation.
>
> Establish special "task forces" of professional personnel to study, evaluate and make such recommendations as will improve matters under consideration.
>
> Review and seek to implement the findings and recommendations of the task forces by referral to the several institutions and the State Board of Education.[54]

Upper division status must be given if a student has a "C" average. Junior college transfers are considered as having met general education requirements if the junior college has certified that the student has completed lower division general education requirements.[55] This is true whether he holds graduate status or not. Of course, transfer credit is given to all courses that parallel those offerings in the four-year institutions.

The University College or Lower Division, as it is referred to, is in one sense the "junior college" within the University of Florida complex offering Associate in Arts degrees. Nattress[56] points out, however, studies indicate that those students who complete their Associate degree at a junior college encounter less academic difficulty after transfer to the University.

---

[54] Ibid.

[55] Lewis, op. cit., p. 577, and Kintzer, "Articulation is an Opportunity, op. cit., p. 19.

[56] John A. Nattress, "The Junior College Transition to Engineering in Florida," Engineering Education, 59:231, November, 1968.

In the spring of 1966, a Task Force in Engineering was set up by the Florida State Board of Education and produced a report on articulation in engineering which analyzed guidance, counseling, terminal technical programs, curriculum, and faculty qualifications.[57] Such procedures are to be considered highly beneficial to the entire articulation process. Indeed, most procedures to date have emphasized the transfer program while slighting the ever-growing terminal curriculums.

New York. Early in 1964, the Board of Regents in New York published a basic policy statement that explains the educational soundness of the comprehensive community college. It took into account the task of preserving a high degree of articulation and coordination with both the high schools and upper division collegiate levels of education. The following two recommendations are intended to preserve the historical articulation and complementary services of the secondary schools and community colleges in the occupational training field:

> . . . Continued encouragement of an articulated and coordinated development of both area vocational programs under local public school auspices and community college programs leading directly to employment as technicians and semiprofessional workers. The State should continue to make full use of all available resources for preparing technicians and semiprofessional workers, and such complete utilization should emphasize coordinated planning and development at both local and state levels.

---

[57] Ibid., p. 233.

> That the Education Law be amended to permit public two-year colleges to offer programs of less than two years' duration as regular day offerings when these programs meet the needs of persons who have graduated from high school or are beyond the usual age of high school attendance.[58]

In 1962, the State University of New York and the New York State Association of Engineering Deans developed a two-year university-parallel program in engineering science for junior colleges.[59] As of 1967, twenty-four of the thirty-six two-year colleges offered the engineering science program leading to the Associate in Science degree. Because of the accessibility of two-year colleges, more students have an opportunity to take an Associate degree and then transfer to a baccalaureate program in engineering.

A major concern is the relative difficulty that is encountered when transferring to engineering institutions in New York State. As a result, many students go out of the State. While the senior institutions have sufficient capacity to absorb the students, it is claimed that these students are scholastically weaker.[60]

As of 1966, little was done to ease the transfer situation in the State and it was suggested that more use of the summer period would help make up deficiencies. Most senior institutions listed among transfer weaknesses difficulty in adjusting to a new environment, poor subject matter preparation, and lower ability levels than the typical four-year college student. Indeed, very few of the fifteen engineering colleges expect the transfer student to make a significant impact on the make up of their junior classes in the next few years.[61]

---

[58] S. V. Martorana, "Progress and Plans in the Empire State," Junior College Journal, 35:12, May, 1965.

[59] Donald F. Berth and John T. Henderson, "Community College and Engineering College Interaction in New York State," Engineering Education, 59:223, November, 1968.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 225.

Maryland. In Maryland, the Master Plan states that community college students should suffer no credit or grade-point losses when they transfer to four-year colleges.[62] If enrollment is limited, the qualified transfer student's application is approved before that of a freshman. The senior colleges are "no more restrictive than necessary in accepting those credits that are not essential to a transfer's major field of study" according to the Plan.[63] Two other aspects are appropriate as follows:

---

[61] Ibid., p. 226.

[62] Kay Mills, "Higher Education Council's Plan May Affect Thousands," The Evening Sun, Baltimore, January 10, 1969, p. C4.

[63] Moses S. Koch, Digest, Master Plan for Higher Education in Maryland: Phase I (Baltimore: Essex Community College, February 20, 1969), pp. I-36, citing Dr. Joseph N. Hankin, President of Harford Community College [Md.] for use of his Master Plan Digest. (Mimeographed.)

> D-8. Community colleges and the institutions in the private sector should establish cooperative relationships in order to promote the interests of the students and the colleges as well as the larger interests of the State.
>
> D-9. The Maryland Council for Higher Education should bring together the representatives of the several public segments and of the private institutions to study the broad problems of the transfer of students and credits among all levels of higher education.[64]

Inter-institutional cooperation is suggested in such areas as cooperative programs, courses, visiting scholars, and other general consortia. However, there still exists some serious deficiencies with reference to high school student migration. Maryland sends a large percentage of its secondary students to other states for higher education. These students have higher high school grades than do those students going to Maryland colleges.

There also exists a lack of fiscal coordination between the various segments of higher education in Maryland. The problem is basically that a certain amount of money is available for higher education and each segment is separately vying for a share. The actual distribution of funds becomes an executive decision without the benefit of statewide educational considerations. The Council for Higher Education reports that this "lack of an adequately coordinated approach means that the higher education system forfeits the right to recommend statewide educational priorities, and at the same time permits possible unnecessary duplication of facilities and programs."[65]

---

[64] See Koch, Digest, Master Plan for Higher Education in Maryland: Phase I.

To fulfill its responsibilities, the Council recognizes the necessity of working with the several governing boards and with the institutions themselves, the variety of State agencies whose concerns include higher education, the United States Office of Education, and also other such agencies in the states. It must also maintain working relations with the executive and legislative branches of the State's government, with numerous other professional organizations, and with the entire community. Consequently, effective articulation depends on a joint partnership of both educational and noneducational influences.

Summary

Articulation factors and techniques greatly influence the relative status of the two-year college. The transfer process is being developed so that it aids the student in transferring upward from the high school to the junior college and from the junior college to a senior institution. This transition stage is ideally suited to the junior college as an intermediate step between the high school and four-year college.

---

[65] See Koch, Digest, Master Plan for Higher Education in Maryland: Phase I.

Furthermore, the articulation process enhances the position of the two-year college as it necessarily involves itself with four-year colleges and universities. To be sure, the two-year college also accepts a reverse articulation function which involves the acceptance of unsuccessful four-year college students.

Present articulation procedures deal mainly with academic programs and have been aimed at transfer programs in the high schools, junior colleges, and four-year institutions. While little has been done to produce effective communication between vocational-occupational programs, the two-year college is making serious efforts to articulate these programs with others in higher education. And, while the articulation process was effectively controlled by four-year institutions, it is rapidly being dominated by the sheer massiveness of the junior college movement. To be sure, senior institutions often find it advantageous to be aware of the extending influence of the two-year college as an equal partner in higher education.

The junior college finds itself in a favorable position as it attempts to provide the means whereby each level of education seeks to understand the others. All phases of the educational process are open to articulation techniques and are brought into an interplay, usually in an informal manner. However, articulation plans become meaningless if left in too general a condition. Also, if written in terms too specific, such plans become unwieldy. Consequently, the two-year college is performing an articulation function in higher education that has yet to be clearly defined.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper has considered two general hypotheses with reference to the public two-year college. The first would associate or identify this institution more closely with the secondary schools rather than senior colleges. The second would more closely identify the junior college with higher education rather than secondary education. It is suggested that while both hypotheses have various degrees of merit, the latter is definitely predominant.

The community-junior college is best viewed today as an institution of higher education. It has not, however, shed itself sufficiently of the yoke of secondary education. Furthermore, its acceptance in higher education is still incomplete. The American Association of University Professors has recently taken the following position:

> . . . [Junior colleges] should be brought into full partnership in higher education and . . . this purpose is most likely to be achieved by promoting AAUP principles and programs on these campuses. Consequently, the AAUP encourages the implementation of the same professional standards and principles within the junior colleges as it encourages in other institutions of higher education.[1]

---

[1] See AAUP position in general correspondence of March 4, 1969 as stated by Bertram H. Davis, General Secretary (Washington: American Association of University Professors, March 4, 1969). (Mimeographed.)

The community-junior college of today is quite different from its counterpart of the early 1900's. To be sure, it will also be different from its counterpart in the future. The two-year college has not yet achieved a complete identity of its own. It is still viewed as a unique institution in the process of being "fitted" into the hierarchical structure of higher education. Indeed, it constitutes the foremost determinant in decentralizing higher education at the present time.

Terminological factors often influence one's acceptance or rejection of this institution as a part of higher education. For example, higher education has been designated as twelfth grade, post-secondary, grades thirteen onward, collegiate, or, more commonly, college and university education. The meaning of the word "college" is being transformed to include the connotations affixed to the people's college--the community college. We are presently realigning our former terminological concepts of higher education to make room for its newest member--the one which attempts to make higher education available to the masses. Illiteracy is diminished, college degrees take on the value of the former high school diploma, education extends formally for two years, informally for life, and higher education now takes on a broadened definition as it slowly accepts a partnership with the junior college.

Differentiating or analyzing the junior college in the light of secondary or higher education necessarily requires a logical analysis of subtle pieces of information. Indeed, the information presented in this paper is often conjectural and covert, even though well-documented. This study is based upon the relative degree of self-identity that the junior college has acquired from its inter-relationships with the high schools and senior colleges. The quest for status and identity has significantly brought the junior college closer to higher education while at the same time removing it further from the influences of secondary education. Neither transition is complete. Indeed, neither should be completed in the "total" sense.

To further the identity differentiation from secondary schools, the two-year college makes use of some tested techniques of higher education, among which are faculty rank, academic and faculty governance as vested in councils and senates, and participation and acceptance in appropriate organizations such as the American Association of University Professors.

A junior college with the stigma of secondary education attached is as undesirable as a junior college that becomes a four-year institution of higher education due to poor state planning. The uniqueness of the two-year college is its relative degree of separation and attachment in the light of its upper and lower appendages, the colleges and high schools respectively. Even this point has various degrees of relevance. The junior college is indeed a "middle" institution for some, a "beginning" institution for others, a "terminal" situation for some, or an institution providing a "continuing" function in education for others. To be sure, the junior college is only slightly more a two-year institution than it is a one-year, three-year, or many-year institution.

By its very nature, the junior college is often viewed in the light of what it is not--it is not a high school; it is not a senior college or university. Those functions that remain appear to be definitive of the junior college. This "many things to many people" creed is seen to be an inherent danger to the two-year college concept. Some practical limitations do exist and perhaps others should be considered or imposed.

Many community-junior colleges are unable to fully develop their comprehensiveness. Due to geographic, fiscal, political or economic necessity, some of these institutions "specialize" in a more limited capacity. Some fully develop their occupational programs at the expense of transfer curriculums. This is usually anticipated for those junior colleges that find themselves in geographic proximity with an accredited university. Some two-year colleges find it

4

beneficial to share their comprehensiveness by subdividing their various functions and curriculums. Comprehensiveness as a maximum effort is mainly enjoyed by those institutions that find favorable conditions relative to economy, geography, population, and general socio-economic variables.

All things not being equal, it becomes necessary to examine further the relative position of the two-year college with high schools and colleges. While the junior college is designed to fit "in-between", some are, by necessity, further developed than others. Indeed, there are good junior colleges and there are those of much lesser standing. The rating technique is rather general and perhaps arbitrary. General evaluation and accreditation techniques are, for the most part, poor indicators of status for the two-year college. They are in need of revision in order to become more effective. A more realistic approach to evaluation is favored over general philosophical ones.

Many junior colleges "rate" themselves only in the light of their transfer programs. They are chiefly concerned with the number of students and courses that are acceptable to senior institutions. Others rate themselves according to the number of positions or jobs that their graduates secure. Many situations, however, are not fully recognized or accounted for. Many students "transfer" on their own time schedule, often without a complete transcript or, indeed, often without the Associate degree. It is also difficult to evaluate the vocational programs, especially in the light of those who merely want to "brush up" as opposed to those who have a desire to begin a new career or retrain for one.

It is also a feature of the community-junior college to allow students to sample courses and curriculums until a suitable one is found. Consequently, any evaluation in this area is generally meaningless until some decision or commitment is made by the student. Suffice it to say that assessing the two-year college, in the light of its students and programs, is indeed a complex situation in need of further research.

Administrative and organizational patterns tend to identify the two-year college as a unique institution in higher education. It is here that this institution expresses basic differences between itself and the secondary schools. Present trends place basic control and development in boards that are solely responsible for the two-year college with few exceptions. It must be noted, however, that achieving the status of higher education is, by necessity, a lengthy and complex process. It involves much more than naming a president and assigning rank to teachers.

In general, legislation and legal implications support the higher education status of the two-year college. Most states have provided the legal basis for the junior college to exist as a full partner in higher education. Furthermore, state and federal funding legislation has been written to include the two-year college with four-year institutions.

State master plans also reveal a legislative intent that favors the separation of the junior college from secondary education while at the same time bringing it into a consortium with senior colleges and universities. Due to state planning, policy and decision-making at all levels is becoming forcibly responsive to the needs of the junior college. Also, as the states begin to accept the popular notion of extending free public education for two years beyond high school, the junior college enhances its present position more firmly.

The general technique of articulating between the various levels of education is especially suited to the junior college movement. Indeed, the two-year college is providing the means by which interrelationships are established to facilitate an interchange of programs, students, and resources, among the various educational levels. Articulation leadership is generally provided by legislative design and employs informal persuasion rather than edict. By design, articulation procedures have enhanced the higher education image of the two-year college as it bridges the gap between the secondary schools and four-year institutions.

In general, the two-year college has failed to develop self study programs. It has enjoyed growth and success so rapidly that a false sense of security has developed. Growth does not necessarily imply success. An in-depth search into the purposes, functions, programs, and curriculums is necessary for the two-year college. This self-appraisal must be sincere and long-ranged. Inter-institutional development must also be observed and evaluated in a manner as yet to be determined. The identity and status of the community-junior college still remains partially shrouded by these unknown factors.

The national assessment program is one means by which junior college programs could be evaluated in the light of what the high schools and senior colleges are doing. This program of assessment also has the potential of revealing the effects of standards and accreditation as employed on a statewide or regional basis. In fact, interstate and interregional comparisons would definitely have a beneficial effect in moderating and bringing together some of the many independent or aloof factions within the entire junior college movement.

No longer is the junior college able to be viewed as a simple "local" institution. While its strength always lies in local support and control, its educational impact is felt on a much broader level. As the two-year institution strives to retain and develop its position in higher education, it becomes concerned about maintaining quality on a par with quantity. To be sure, everyone does not need a university type of education, but all should seek a continuing education. It is here that extended education and, indeed, remedial education are arbitrarily grouped with adult education and made the "unique function" of the two-year college. While these services may necessarily overlap, they are intrinsically different.

The continuing education function is generally allotted to junior colleges and high schools. When this education is generally free of academic standing and, of course, credit value, it is most often placed as a function of the secondary schools. The only exception occurs if the secondary schools are unable or unequipped to handle this responsibility. Such a deficiency often occurs at the higher end of the academic scale. For instance, many geographic areas are without the resources or availability of graduate education facilities. Consequently, a well-developed two-year college is capable of providing the facilities and initiative to support university education within its confines.

The community-junior college often shares and fulfills certain responsibilities of both the secondary schools and the senior colleges while still retaining a unique identity of its own. It is in those areas that overlap that we find ourselves with what appears to be an obvious educational paradox. Is the two-year college a part of secondary education or higher education? Indeed, some educators would merely treat this question as a paradoxical exercise of mental ingenuity. As such, it would be futile to apply logic with intent to provide a solution. Such is not the hypothesis of this paper.

It is concluded here that the two-year college is presently much closer in status and identity with the senior colleges and universities rather than the secondary schools. A more definitive or conclusive statement of findings is, at present, unjustified. The relative position of today's two-year college is not to be viewed as an either-or situation with reference to secondary and higher education. Rather, it is an ever-changing educational innovation that selectively characterizes certain aspects of secondary education and certain aspects of higher education with a still greater degree of its own character such that it represents a new and unique institution of higher education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Blocker, Clyde E., and Henry A. Campbell. Administrative Practices in University Extension Centers and Branch Colleges. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1963.

———, et al. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Boucher, Chauncey S. The Chicago College Plan. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935.

Brick, Michael. Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Burt, Samuel M. Industry and Vocational-Technical Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Eells, Walter Crosby. The Junior College. Boston: The Riverside Press, 1931.

———. Present Status of Junior College Terminal Education. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941.

Emerson, Lynn A. "Technical Education and the Two-Year Community College," Technical Education News. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, [illegible].

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. This Is the Community College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Harbeson, John W. Classifying Junior College Students. Pasadena: Pasadena City Schools, 1932.

Hillway, Tyrus. The American Two-Year College. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Koos, Leonard V. The Junior College Movement. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1925.

Krug, Edward A. The Shaping of the American High School. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Me[illegible] [illegible] Junior College: Progress and Prospect. [illegible]-Hill, 1960.

Ta[illegible] [illegible] in Education. New York: [illegible], 1951.

Thornton, James W., Jr. The Community Junior College. New York and London: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., [illegible]

B. PERIODICALS

Alden, John D. "Degrees in Engineering and Industrial Technology, 1967-1968," Engineering Education, 59:254-256, November, 1968.

Allen, Lucille, et al. "The Nature and Functions of Higher Education," College and University, 35:29-33, Fall, 1959.

Anderson, John E., Jr. "Research in the Junior College: Anathema or Anodyne?" Junior College Journal, 35:15-18, November, 1964.

Angell, James R. "Problems Peculiar to the Junior College," The School Review, 25:[illegible], June, 1917.

______. "The Junior-College Movement [illegible]," The School Review, [illegible], 1915.

Ar[illegible] "Vocational [illegible]," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, [illegible], November, 1954.

Ba[illegible] "Curriculum in the Community College [illegible] Unanswered Questions," California Education, 3:19-27, February, 1966.

Be[illegible] and John T. Henderson. "Community College-[illegible] College Interaction in New York State," Engineering Education, 59:223-226, November, 1968.

Ba[illegible], and T. W. Fryer, Jr. "Miami Begins the [illegible] in College Teaching," Junior College Journal, 39:[illegible], February, 1969.

Bolman, Frederick deW. "New Opportunities in Articulation," Junior College Journal, 36:20-23, March, 1966.

Bolton, Frederick E. "Accreditation in Democratic Education," *University of Washington College of Education Record*, 8: 34, January, 1942.

______. "Some Probably Effects Upon Higher Education Due to the Development of Junior Colleges," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, 5:85-93, February, 1919.

______. "Suggestions for the Post-War Development of Junior Colleges," *University of Washington College of Education Record*, 10:91-92, April, 1944.

______. "What Should Constitute the Curriculum of the Junior College or Extended High School?" *School and Society*, 8:726-727, December, 1918.

Brick, Michael. "Two Plus Two," *Junior College Journal*, 38: 25-29, October, 1967.

Brouillet, Frank B. "The Development of Financial Support for Washington State Community Colleges," *University of Washington College of Education Record*, 31:23, January, 1965.

Brown, J. Stanley. "Present Development of Secondary Schools According to the Proposed Plan," *The School Review*, 13: 15-17, January, 1905.

Burns, Norman. "Association Notes and Editorial Comments," *The North Central Association Quarterly*, 36:309-313, Spring, 1962.

______. "Some Basic Problems of Accrediting," *The North Central Association Quarterly*, 35:193-197, October, 1960.

______. "Changing Concepts of Higher Education," *The North Central Association Quarterly*, 38:296-300, Spring, 1964.

Castell, Aubrey. "Wanted: A New Deal for the Liberal Arts College," *University of Washington College of Education Record*, 22:18, January, 1956.

Christian, Floyd T., and James L. Wattenbarger. "Ten Years--A Plan Evolves in Florida," *Junior College Journal*, 38: 44-47, September, 1967.

Cohen, Arthur M. "Developing Specialists in Learning," *Junior College Journal*, 37:21-23, September, 1966.

Collins, Charles C. "Exporting the Junior College Idea," *Junior College Journal*, 38:10-14, April, 1968.

Collins, John J. "Accreditation Aims and Perceptions," *Junior College Journal*, 38:19-23, December, 1967-January, 1968.

Committee on Standards of The American Council of Education. "Standards and Principles for Accrediting Junior Colleges," *Educational Record*, 5:202-204, July, 1924.

________. "The Junior College," *Educational Record*, 2:68-69, April, 1921.

Corbally, John E. "Some Critical Issues in Secondary Education," *University of Washington College of Education Record*, 12:18-19, December, 1945.

Cox, Miriam. "The College Is for Everyone Cult," *Junior College Journal*, 37:37-39, September, 1966.

Coursault, Jesse H. "Standardizing the Junior College," *Educational Review*, 49:59-62, January, 1915.

Cross, K. Patricia. "Higher Education's Newest Student," *Junior College Journal*, 39:38-42, September, 1968.

Cresci, Gerald D., and Carl G. Winter. "The Junior College As A Partner in Higher Education," *California Schools*, 34:31-40, February, 1963.

Devall, W. B. "Community Colleges: A Dissenting View," *Educational Record*, 49:168-172, Spring, 1968.

Deyo, Donald E. "Three Cliches," *Junior College Journal*, 34:6-7, September, 1963.

Dotson, George E. "Advantages to the Junior College of 'Common Administration' School Districts," *Journal of Secondary Education*, 38:148-150, March, 1963.

Doyle, Walter. "Community-College Concept in Higher Education," *Catholic Educational Review*, 64:251-262, April, 1966.

Dunlap, E. T. "Oklahoma Looks to 1970," *Junior College Journal*, 39:29-32, February, 1969.

"Editorial Notes," *The School Review*, 14:609, October, 1906.

"Education Adjusted to Needs," *Higher Education for American Democracy*, 1:67, December, 1947.

"Educational Events," *School and Society*, 50:432, September, 1939.

"Educational Events," *School and Society*, 41:328, March, 1935.

"Emphasis," *Junior College Journal*, 39:3, February, 1969.

Erickson, Clifford G. "Illinois Balances Statewide Planning and Local Autonomy," *Junior College Journal*, 38:23-26, March, 1968.

Fretwell, E. K. "Issues Facing Community Colleges Today," *Today's Education*, 57:46-47, October, 1968.

Friedman, Norman L. "Comprehensiveness and Higher Education: A Sociologist's View of Public Junior College Trends," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, 52:417-423, December, 1966.

Fox, Raymond B. "Improving Relations Between High Schools and Colleges," *Education Digest*, 27:49-51, May, 1962.

Garrison, Roger H. "Professional Teacher or Dedicated Amateur?" *School and Society*, 93:390-392, October, 1965.

______. "Unique Problems of Junior Colleges," *National Education Association Journal*, 56:30-32, November, 1967.

Gillie, Angelo C. "New Jersey Community Colleges: A Report and Prognosis," *Junior College Journal*, 38:34-37, November, 1967.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "Junior College and Technical Education," *School and Society*, 94:340-341, October, 1966.

______. "Junior College Explosion," *American Education*, 5:12-13, December, 1968-January, 1969.

______. "Concerns and Cautions for Community Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, 38:18-21, March, 1968.

______. "AAJC Approach," *Junior College Journal*, 37:5, September, 1966.

Gombar, William. "From Business School to a Modern Junior College," *Education*, 88:241-244, February-March, 1968.

Graham, Walter A. "It May Happen in Alabama, Too!" Junior College Journal, 35:28-29, November, 1964.

Gray, A. A. "The Junior College in California," The School Review, 23:465-473, September, 1915.

Gunn, Henry M., and Everett V. O'Rourke. "California Legislature Terminates Department's Role in Accrediting Secondary Schools," California Education, 3:5-7, June, 1966.

Harper, William A. "Public Relations Problems Discussed by Practitioners," Junior College Journal, 38:42, October, 1967.

______. "West Florida's New Two-Year University," Junior College Journal, 37:13-15, September, 1966.

Harper, William Rainey. "The High School of the Future," The School Review, 11:1-3, January, 1903.

Harrington, John C. "Academic Rank in the Community College," Junior College Journal, 35:24-26, March, 1965.

Hedgepeth, Victor W. B. "The Six-Year High School Plan at Goshen, Indiana," The School Review, January, 1905.

Hickok, Helen. "Ask the Junior College Parents What They Think!" Junior College Journal, 35:24-27, November, 1964.

"High School Terminology," The School Review, 23:491-492, September, 1915.

Jacobsen, Joseph M. "The Junior College Idea in South America," Junior College Journal, 38:9-13, November, 1968.

Johnson, B. Lamar. "The Two-Year College," The Journal of Higher Education, 37:409-410, October, 1966.

Johnston, Charles Hughes. "High School Terminology," Educational Review, 49:228-247, March, 1915.

"Junior College Institutional Growth Rate Spirals in 1967," Junior College Journal, 38:60, October, 1967.

"Junior Colleges," School and Society, 94:380, November, 1966.

Kaufman, Jacob J., *et al.* "Role of Secondary Schools in Preparing Youth for Jobs," *Bulletin of The National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 52:112-113, February, 1968.

Kintzer, Frederick C. "Articulation is an Opportunity," *Junior College Journal*, 37:16-19, April, 1967.

_______. "The California Plan of Articulation," *College and University*, 43:155-161, Winter, 1968.

_______. "What University and College Admissions Officers Should Know About Two Year Colleges," *College and University*, 42:459-478, Summer, 1967.

Knoll, Erwin. "The Maturing of the Junior College," *National Education Association Journal*, 50:27-29, February, 1961.

Koos, Leonard V. "Conditions Favoring Integration of Junior College with High Schools," *School Life*, 12:161-164, May, 1927.

Lahti, Robert E. "A Faculty Role in Policy Formulation," *Junior College Journal*, 37:9-12, September, 1966.

Laine, Oliver. "Interim Facilities: Blessing or Boomerang?" *Junior College Journal*, 39:25-26, November, 1968.

"Letters," *Junior College Journal*, 38:38-40, May, 1968.

"Letters," *Junior College Journal*, 36:48, February, 1966.

Lewis, Irvin G. "Junior-Senior College Articulation Plans: Florida, Michigan, California," *College and University*, 43:576-586, Summer, 1968.

Lillard, J. B. "The 6-3-3-2 vs. the 6-4-4 Plan of Organization for the Public Junior College," *School and Society*, 32:262-264, August, 1930.

Littlefield, Henry W. "Critical Issues Facing America's Junior Colleges," *School and Society*, 89:72, February, 1961.

Logsdon, James D. "A Case for the Junior College," *Bulletin of The National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 52:62-65, December, 1968.

Lombardi, John. "California's New State Board," Junior College Journal, 38:27-31, March, 1968.

MacLean, Malcolm S. "Social Forces and the Junior College," National Education Association Journal, 45:222-223, April, 1956.

Magruder, William T. "The Junior College as Relief," Educational Review, 61:286-297, April, 1921.

Mallan, John P. "Commission Commitments," Junior College Journal, 36:52, May, 1966.

Mansfield, Henry, Jr. "Engineering Liaison Committee Planning in California," Engineering Education, 59:227-230, November, 1968.

Martorana, S. V. "Progress and Plans in the Empire State," Junior College Journal, 35:10-13, May, 1965.

_______. "Developments in State-Level Governance," Junior College Journal, 39:25-29, January, 1969.

_______, and Robert F. McHugh. "State Legislation: 1962-64," Junior College Journal, 36:27-31, 34, 36, March, 1966.

Masiko, Peter, Jr. "A Rebuttal to W. B. Devall's 'Community Colleges: A Dissenting View,'" Educational Record, 49: 173-176, Spring, 1968.

Mathies, Lorraine. "Junior College Educators Indicate Information They Need," Junior College Journal, 38;24-26, November, 1967.

Mayhew, Louis B. "What's Ahead for Higher Education?" National Education Association Journal, 56:16-18, December, 1967.

McConaughy, James L. "The Future of the College in the Middle West," School and Society, 9:607-613, May, 1919.

McLane, C. L. "The Junior College, or Upward Extension of the High School," The School Review, 21:161-170, March, 1913.

Meadows, Mark E., and Ronald R. Ingle. "Reverse Articulation: A Unique Function of the Junior College," College and University, 44:47-54, Fall, 1968.

Medsker, Leland L. "The Junior-College Picture," National Education Association Journal, 47:628-630, December, 1958.

Merson, Thomas B. "The Crisis in Accreditation," *Junior College Journal*, 35:6-8, February, 1965.

Mikalson, Roy G. "In California: Impact of Probationary Teacher Legislation," *Junior College Journal*, 37:44-48, September, 1966.

Morrison, D. G. "So You Plan to Change Your Junior College to a Four-Year Institution?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, 47:442-443, April, 1966.

_______. "Articulation of the High School and the Public Community Junior College in the United States," *Bulletin of The National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 43:102-107, September, 1959.

Morrisett, Lloyd N. "Educational Assessment and the Junior College," *Junior College Journal*, 37:12-14, March, 1967.

Nattress, John A. "The Junior College Transition to Engineering in Florida," *Engineering Education*, 59:231-233, November, 1968.

"N.C.A. Announces Optional Eligibility Procedure," *Junior College Journal*, 38:59, September, 1967.

Nelson, James H. "Do Junior College Transfers Make the Grade?" *The National Education Journal*, 54:55-57, October, 1965.

_______. "Guidelines for Articulation," *Junior College Journal*, 36:24-26, March, 1966.

"News Backgrounds," *Junior College Journal*, 38:54, October, 1967.

"News Backgrounds," *Junior College Journal*, 38:50, April, 1968.

"News Backgrounds," *Junior College Journal*, 38:48-54, May, 1968.

"News Backgrounds," *Junior College Journal*, 39:84, December, 1968-January, 1969.

"News in Education," *Chicago Schools Journal*, 45:234, February, 1964.

Ohles, John F. "Extended Schooling Versus Higher Education," *School and Society*, 92:156-157, April, 1964.

Okerlund, G. M. "Junior College Graduates in the Universities," School and Society, 29:676-677, May, 1929.

Parker, Franklin. "Continuity Between High School and College," Educational Leadership, 18:346-350, March, 1961.

Pearson, Richard. "National Admissions Testing Programs--Their Value to Colleges--Their Impact on Secondary Schools," College and University, 39:488-514, Summer, 1964.

Peik, W. E. "What Better Accreditation Means," National Education Association Journal, 39:186-187, March, 1950.

Pesci, Frank B., and Royal Hart. "The Question of Governance In Maryland," Junior College Journal, 38:7-9, February, 1968.

Peterson, B. H. "The Role of the Junior College in California," California Education, 1:3-8, October, 1963.

Pierce, E. C., and others. "Twenty-seventh Semi-Annual Meeting of The Michigan Schoolmasters' Club," The School Review, 5:95-128, February, 1897.

Price, Hugh G. "Public Schools Through Grade 14," National Education Association Journal, 48:10, December, 1959.

Priest, Bill J. "Faculty-Administration Relationships," Junior College Journal, 34:4-8, March, 1964.

_______. "On the Threshold of Greatness," Junior College Journal, 37:6-8, September, 1966.

Reynolds, James W. "We're Mighty Proud of Junior," National Education Association Journal, 42:212-213, April, 1953.

Roueche, John E. "Gaps and Overlaps in Institutional Research," Junior College Journal, 38:20-23, November, 1967.

Scannel, William J. "What Do Teachers Think About English in the Two-Year College?" Junior College Journal, 37:24-29, September, 1966.

Schultz, Raymond E. "A Follow-up on Honor Students," Junior College Journal, 38:9-18, December, 1967-January, 1968.

_______. "Scholarships for Junior College Transfer Students," School and Society, 89:86-87, February, 1961.

Seay, C. W. "High School-College Articulation," Bulletin of The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 48:57-61, September, 1964.

Selden, William K., and William G. Land. "The Forgotten Colleges," The North Central Association Quarterly, 35:271-273, April, 1961.

Seyfert, Warren C. "Do Colleges Determine What the High Schools Teach?" Education Digest, 26:28-31, November, 1960.

Shaw, Sterling L. "Knowledge Equals Credit or How to Enter College As A Sophomore," College and University, 43:534-535, Summer, 1968.

Showman, H. M. "Junior College Transfers at the University of California at Los Angeles," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, 4:319-322, June, 1929.

Sicuro, N. A. "University Branches: Solution for College Crush," School and Society, 94:458-459, December, 1966.

Simon, Lora S. "The Cooling Out Function of the Junior College," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 45:973-978, June, 1967.

Skaggs, Kenneth G. "Report from St. Louis," Junior College Journal, 37:40-43, September, 1966.

Stanley, James W. "The Oldest Junior College," Junior College Journal, 36:37-38, November, 1965.

Stewart, W. Blair. "Liberal Arts Colleges As Glorified High Schools," School and Society, 87:325, June, 1959.

Strawbridge, James R., and James L. Wattenbarger. "Articulation--Florida Style," Junior College Journal, 37:50-52, March, 1967.

Sulkin, Sidney. "The Challenge Summarized," Bulletin of The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 50:74-90, Summer, 1966.

"The Junior College," Educational Review, 49:215-216, February, 1915.

Toews, Emil O. "California Leads with Many 'Firsts' in Junior College Education," California Education, 1:19-20, January, 1964.

Toews, Emil O. "Janus Looks at the Junior College," *California Education*, 1:7-8, 10, June, 1964.

———. "Nursing Education--A Community Service," *California Education*, 1:19-20, 30, March, 1964.

———. "The Accreditation of Junior Colleges in California," *California Education*, 1:19-20, December, 1963.

———. "The Present Status of Junior College Education in California," *California Education*, 2:13-15, May, 1965.

———. "The Role of the Bureau," *California Education*, 1:33-39, September, 1963.

Tressler, A. W., and others. "Twenty-seventh Semi-Annual Meeting of The Michigan Schoolmasters' Club," *The School Review*, 5:95-128, February, 1897.

Tuthill, Richard L., *et al.* "Commencement Procedures and Degree Terminology," *College and University*, 38:494-496, Summer, 1963.

"Two Legislative Landmarks in One Month," *Junior College Journal*, 34:4-5, February, 1964.

Tyler, Henry T. "Full Partners in California's Higher Education," *Junior College Journal*, 35:4-5, March, 1965.

Vail, Curtis C. D. "Adult Education," *University of Washington College of Education Record*, 11:49-55, February, 1945.

Vocolo, Joseph M., and Douglas C. Sheppard. "High School-College Intervisitation," *The Modern Language Journal*, 50:477-478, November, 1966.

Warren, James R. "Comprehensiveness May Depend on Public Relations," *Junior College Journal*, 38:24-25, April, 1968.

Warriner, E. C., and others. "Twenty-seventh Semi-Annual Meeting of The Michigan Schoolmasters' Club," *The School Review*, 5:95-128, February, 1897.

Wattenbarger, James L. "Changing Patterns of Control," *Junior College Journal*, 38:9-11, May, 1968.

Wilbur, R. L. "The Junior College--A Message," *Sierra Educational News*, 23:147, 1926.

Wood, William R. "The Community College," National Education Association Journal, 44:16-17, January, 1955.

Young, Raymond. "Critical Times for North Central Area Junior College Development," The North Central Association Quarterly, 36:323-327, Spring, 1962.

C. PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND ITS AGENCIES

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Selected Education Acts of 1963. United States Senate Committee, 88th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

Eells, Walter Crosby, and Harold A. Hasiwell. Academic Degrees. Office of Education, Bulletin No. 28. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

Morrison, D. G., and S. V. Martorana. "Are Public 2-Year Colleges Secondary or Higher Education?" State Formulas for the Support of Public 2-Year Colleges. Office of Education, Bulletin 1962, No. 14. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.

______, and S. V. Martorana. Criteria for the Establishment of 2-Year Colleges. Office of Education, Bulletin 1961, No. 2. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961.

D. ESSAYS AND ARTICLES IN PUBLICATIONS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES AND IN COLLECTIONS

An Introduction to American Junior Colleges. Reprinted from American Junior Colleges, Seventh Edition. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

Cory, Arthur F. "Universal Educational Opportunity Beyond the High School," Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington: National Education Association, 1964.

Charters, Alexander N. "Pressures on Higher Education for Adult Education Services," Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington: National Education Association, 1965.

Commission on Higher Education. "Equalizing Opportunity Through Adult Education," *Higher Education for American Democracy*. A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1947.

Folwell, W. W. *University Addresses*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: H. W. Wilson Company, 1909.

Gardner, John. "Quality in Higher Education," *Current Issues in Higher Education*. Washington: National Education Association, 1958.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. *Junior Colleges: An Introduction*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1963.

Koos, Leonard V. *The Junior College*. Research publications of the University of Minnesota, Education Series, 2 vols. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1924.

Knoell, Dorothy M. "How Can Two- and Four-Year Colleges Provide Articulation in the Face of Rapid Change?" *Current Issues in Higher Education*. Washington: National Education Association, 1964.

________, and Leland L. Medsker. *Factors Affecting Performance of Transfer Students from Two-to-Four-Year Colleges: With Implications for Coordination and Articulation*. Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1964.

________, and Leland L. Medsker. *Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges*. Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1964.

Medsker, Leland L. *The Junior College--A Powerful Motivating Force for Educational Advantage*. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1961.

National Education Association. "Aligning Priorities in Junior and Community Colleges," *Current Issues in Higher Education*. Washington: National Education Association, 1965.

Selden, William K. "Struggles and Tensions in Accreditation of Higher Education," *Current Issues in Higher Education*. Washington: National Education Association, 1965.

Stern, George. "Higher Education in the Mass Society," *Current Issues in Higher Education*. Washington: National Education Association, 1964.

The American College. A Series of Papers Setting Forth the Program, Achievements, Present Status, and Probable Future of the American College. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1915.

Zook, George F. "The Junior College in the State's Program of Education," *National Education Association Proceedings*, Vol. 68, June 28-July 4. Washington: National Education Association, 1930.

E. NEWSPAPERS

"Community College Model for Review," *The Sun*, Baltimore, December 8, 1968.

Mills, Kay. "Higher Education Council's Plan May Affect Thousands," *The Evening Sun*, Baltimore, January 10, 1969, Section C, p. 4.

Ollerenshaw, Kathleen. "Wasteful Overlapping Between Schools and Colleges," *The Times Educational Supplement* [London], No. 2763, May 3, 1968.

The Evening Sun, Baltimore, January 12, 20, 27, 1969.

The Morning Call, Allentown [Pa.], February 27, 1969.

The Sun, Baltimore, January 26, 1969.

F. NEWSLETTERS AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Academe. "Conference Activities." Washington: American Association of University Professors, March, 1968.

Johnson, Paul M. "Statements of Position." Baltimore: Maryland Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

Junior College Research Review. "Needed Research in the Junior College," Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, Vol. 2, No. 6, American Association of Junior Colleges. Los Angeles: University of California, April, 1968.

Koch, Moses S. *Digest, Master Plan for Higher Education in Maryland: Phase I.* Baltimore: Essex Community College, February 20, 1969. (Mimeographed.)

Maryland Association of Junior Colleges. *MAJC Newsletter.* Baltimore: Maryland Association of Junior Colleges, December, 1968.

Maryland State Teachers Association. *Legislative Program, 1969.* Baltimore: Maryland State Teachers Association: November, 1968.

_______. "A Master Plan," *Digest, The Higher Education Journal of Maryland*, Higher Education Council, Vol. 1, No. 1. Baltimore: Maryland State Teachers Association, February, 1969.

National Science Foundation. "An Institute for Junior College Teachers of Physics." Laramie: University of Wyoming Physics Department, 1969.

G. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Locks, C. S. "Academic Performance of Students Transferring to Los Angeles Valley College from Two and Four-Year Institutions." Unpublished report, Los Angeles Valley College, 1965.

Muck, S. J. "Analysis of Records of Students Entering El Camino College from Other Institutions." Unpublished report, El Camino College, 1965.

H. OTHER SOURCES

General Assembly of Maryland. *Senate Bills*, Nos. 2, 216, 393, 1968.

Jensen, Oscar. Maryland State Teachers Association Consultant to the Higher Education Council. Telephone interview, February 25, 1969.

Kelsey, Roger B. "Independent State and Local Boards for Higher Education in Maryland." A discussion with Senator Royal Hart [Md.], A.A.U.P. Chapter, Catonsville Community College [Md.], May 9, 1968.

Montague v. Board of Education of Ashland Independent School District, 402 S.W. (2d), 94 (Ky.).

The Lincoln Library of Essential Information. "The Junior College." Buffalo: The Frontier Press Company, 1963.

Washington State Legislature. *House Bills*, Vol. 20, 1927.

_______. *House Bills*, Vol. 29, No. 262, 1945.

_______. *Senate Bills*, Vol. 25, No. 71, 1939.